

making the 9th day of September of each year a legal holiday for Federal employees in the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8813. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the general committee of immigrant aid at Ellis Island, endorsing the Kerr bill (H. R. 8163); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8814. Also, petition of the Foreign Trade Club of Detroit, endorsing reciprocal trade program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8815. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States in behalf of the watch industry and the persons employed therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8816. Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress relative to the use of granite in the construction of public buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

8817. By Mr. WELCH: Joint Resolution No. 43 of the California Assembly, relative to memorializing Congress to furnish aid in the construction of check dams in the Salinas River Valley; to the Committee on Flood Control.

8818. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Ladies Auxiliary Division 6, A. O. H., Utica, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, our Heavenly Father, they that wait upon Thee shall renew their strength. We tarry that we may prepare and adjust ourselves to the ever-changing day. Enable us always to cherish the place of prayer; to neglect it is to allow the higher powers of life to droop and languish. However weak the body, keep the mind strong; however severe the day, let the outlook be unclouded. We entreat Thee to free us from any paralysis of indifference which holds captive and deprives the larger life of the spirit. Guard us from that self-will and from that storm of passion which prevent our emancipation. Let the light of a gracious God break through upon our wandering vision that we may comprehend our city with its needs, and may it encircle our country. O let the glory rest upon them and unite us all in confidence, cooperation, and sacrifice. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 113) entitled "Joint resolution to extend until April 1, 1936, certain provisions of title I of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and for other purposes", with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested; and agrees to the House amendment to the title.

FORWARD, MR. PRESIDENT

Mr. HILDEBRANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILDEBRANDT. Mr. Speaker, I read in the daily papers with great satisfaction that President Roosevelt is planning to send Congress a special message calling for "far-reaching increases in estate and gift taxes and imposition of Federal inheritance levies."

The article to which I refer said that this program would "tax estates, inheritances, and gifts in this Nation to a greater extent than in any nation in the world, it was believed."

I greet this announcement with much pleasure. I know that it will evoke warm approval from millions of others. America is at the crossroads—the dividing of the ways—and if Franklin D. Roosevelt will really take the initiative in leading us down the highway whose destination is a cooperative commonwealth, his name will be blazoned on the path of the ages for all time as one of humanity's saviors. This step is a tremendously important one. It means a break from the old policy of retention of an evil system and a turn toward better things. By all means let the step be taken. Let other steps be taken as well.

As I have repeatedly pointed out in my remarks in this session of Congress, there must be a fundamental, basic readjustment of our social system. Palliatives are not sufficient. There must be a complete and full cure of the economic disease. I have given my support to many temporary and incidental measures because they offered immediate relief for the suffering, although nobody understood better than I that they were only makeshifts that delayed the inevitable crash—for it is certain that a crash will come if we do not furnish a new social set-up whose objective is the welfare of everybody.

In my comments regarding our President I have uniformly attempted to make clear my personal admiration and respect for this lovable, human, kindly man—unquestionably the most progressive President America ever had. I have also sought to indicate my appreciation of his generous and earnest desire to help the suffering. At the same time, I have endeavored to show that I did not approve of a permanent policy of hand-outs and loans and doles. We cannot go on forever lending and borrowing money, and shifting funds back and forth. We must sooner or later evolve a type of society that can take care of itself—that pays its own way—that provides for the people who are engaged in productive work. Why not face this obligation now? "Eventually—why not now?" Why put it off? Somebody must take the leadership and direct the job? For my part, I would rather see Franklin D. Roosevelt assume that responsibility and receive the credit than someone who is a demagogue and whose motives are purely selfish. Yet the fact remains that we are certain of our destination and we shall undoubtedly reach it—whether led by one man or another.

Ella Wheeler Wilcox, years ago in a beautiful and inspiring poem, said:

No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.
Though proudly the victor comes
With fluttering flags and prancing nags
And echoing roll of drums,
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

Ella Wheeler Wilcox's words were true. We who have observed the long and patient struggle for social justice and who have tried to aid in bringing about this ideal, believe—in spite of disappointments and discouragement and delays—that "no question is ever settled until it is settled right" and that economic liberation will finally come for our people.

Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2756) authorizing the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska to bring suit in the United States Court of Claims, and conferring jurisdiction upon said court to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment upon any and all claims which said Indians may have, or claim to have, against the United States, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after "Indians", insert: "or for the failure or refusal of the United States to protect their interests in lands or other tribal or community property in Alaska, and for loss of use of the same."

Page 2, lines 19 and 20, after "therefor", insert: "and the loss to said Indians of their right, title, or interest, arising from occupancy and use, in lands or other tribal or community property, without just compensation therefor, shall be held sufficient ground for relief hereunder."

Page 3, line 23, strike out "which" and insert: "under contract approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, and said contract shall be executed in behalf of said Indians by a committee chosen by them under the direction and approval of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the reading of the Journal and conclusion of matters on the Speaker's table I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, suppose the House should adjourn this afternoon to meet until Monday. There would not be any tomorrow, would there?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SHERMAN ANTITRUST LAW

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have introduced today amends the Sherman Antitrust Act, and should, if enacted into law, remove the last excuse of those who assert that they would be glad to enter into agreements and understandings to guarantee living wages and proper working conditions but fear to do so because they might be prosecuted for a violation of the antitrust laws. My amendment specifically provides that such agreements are legal and exempt from the provisions of the antitrust laws of the United States.

The National Recovery Act, which has been, in effect, declared unconstitutional, is being renewed in emaciated form for a limited period of 9 months. This act sought to establish in trade and industry standards of fair competition and declared that competition through the lowering of wages, the lengthening of hours, and the establishment of sweatshop methods was not fair competition. It, perhaps for the first time in American jurisprudence, laid down the legal principle that the exploitation of labor is no essential or necessary part of economic competition.

This principle should be preserved and written into the permanent law of the land insofar as that is possible, and I believe my amendment is a step forward in the accomplishment of that object.

The Sherman Act and antitrust laws sought to prevent monopoly and unfair competition. The purpose of these acts is to preserve free markets and economic competition. My amendment also has that purpose. By making agreements to establish minimum wages and maximum hours of labor possible and legal, it does not seek to destroy or impair the principle of economic competition. It seeks to civilize competition by limiting it to competition in quality, style, price, and above all, service. It substitutes economic competition for savage, cutthroat competition—the narrow and erroneous Darrow concept. I would, if possible, outlaw the latter type of competition as unsocial, and therefore, undesirable in a democratic nation. I assert that in the future, competition, under the law, should be made to stand the social test.

My amendment, therefore, in no sense contradicts or destroys the principles underlying the antitrust laws. It asserts the same principles and joins with those progressive acts in attempting to establish, by law, economic competition in the national economy of the United States.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's table I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes the gentleman will withhold that request, under the custom which has prevailed during the session, until a later date.

Mr. KNUTE HILL. I will withhold the request, Mr. Speaker.

ADMIRAL STIRLING

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I read an article in the newspaper the other day by an admiral in the United States Navy. Of course, I have said a lot about admirals in the United States Navy. It has been stated that Senator Tom Heflin mortally hated and despised the Pope. If he had ever met the Pope he would have probably found out that he was a nice gentleman, and he would have come to like him. So I am not particularly anxious to meet admirals; more than likely, from a personal viewpoint, they are like anyone else. This is not personal; I view them only from an official angle and what they do officially. Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss an article written by Admiral Yates Stirling, Jr., published in last Sunday's Washington Herald (June 9, 1935). In this article he in effect makes an absolute advocacy of war by the nations of Europe, and all "capitalistic nations", which, of course, includes the United States, against Russia. Let me state here that the subject of communism is absolutely irrelevant to the point at issue, and the issue is that of foreign relations and our relations with Russia. Communism has absolutely nothing to do with the question. We, the United States of America, have recognized Russia, and it is not the business of an admiral to be sticking his nose into things that do not concern him. That is what this admiral is doing.

Mr. MCFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. MCFARLANE. The gentleman would not intimate that an admiral would do anything like that, would he?

Mr. MAVERICK. I am going to say something. I am not going to intimate it. Admiral Stirling made this statement, which will lead us into war if we keep on. This is what he said in reply to a criticism of it. He said:

The whole point is that Congress is afraid of the Communists because the Members have so many in their own districts. New York is a hotbed—

And so on; if you want to see the full article read the Washington Herald of Wednesday, June 12, 1935.

In other words, this admiral when it comes to the attention of the public, that what he says does not concern his business, then he says that you Congressmen are afraid, that you my fellow Congressmen, are afraid of Communists, that you are cowards, that you are afraid to legislate properly and do not do so honestly and patriotically. That is the implication in what he said. We sit here and appropriate him money; will we let him help start a war in which he will be absolutely safe?

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman asked Admiral Stirling whether the newspaper correctly quoted him?

Mr. MAVERICK. No; I have not.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman will do that, because newspapers misquote people so much that the gentle-

man ought to find out whether the statement is authentic or not before he charges a man with it.

Mr. MAVERICK. I think the newspapers do misquote the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. And that is what makes me a little suspicious of any article I see purporting to quote an official.

Mr. MAVERICK. But they rarely misquote an admiral. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I am proceeding on the basis that Admiral Stirling said this, and I feel sure that he will not deny it. In other words, he said that Congress is afraid. In other words, there is an admiral getting his money from the Congress of the United States—

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I will guarantee to my friend from Texas—and he is my friend—that he will not find an admiral in the United States Navy who will ever make an improper remark about Congress. That is one thing admirals are taught not to do when they go to school. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAVERICK. I think there possibly must be an exception; this admiral must not have learned very much. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it not true these admirals have forgotten a lot of things they learned in school?

Mr. MAVERICK. I think these admirals not only forget a good deal they learn in schools, but they know too much. Apparently, this one did not learn anything about discipline, good manners, or the propriety of an admiral interfering in the policies of the State Department.

Mr. SCOTT. And after they have been through a while it does not make any difference.

Mr. MAVERICK. I should like to finish this talk, if the gentleman does not mind.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. DARDEN. I think the gentleman would do well to follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. Admiral Stirling is a capable, efficient officer, and I do not believe he would reflect on the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield to the distinguished critic of the Democratic Party, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. RICH.

Mr. RICH. I would say that if the admiral criticized Members of Congress it probably was not entirely unjustified. It is time the Democratic Party stopped putting legislation through Congress which is detrimental to the country. If Members of Congress had backbone enough they would not stand up here and take the things they do take from the other end of the Avenue, which are all wrong, but would stand up here and do the things they know to be right.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his learned discussion of Admiral Stirling, the laws of the sea, and international law.

Mr. Speaker, I must refuse to yield further. Let me finish my point, because this is really a serious matter and I should like for you to be serious about 5 minutes.

Listen: Admiral Stirling has written numerous articles of the kind which stir up trouble with friendly nations. He may be, as Mr. Darden says, an efficient officer. I am going by what he has written. The admiral proceeds to say in the article that Russia would be a fertile field for colonization. In other words, what he means is that we should invade Russia—with our Army. Now, it is perfectly safe for an admiral to say that, because Russia has not got any navy and he would not have to get into the fighting. You seldom hear generals advocating war, because some of them know something about war. My boy and your boy are the ones who have got to go to war; they are the ones who would be killed, in the infantry, cavalry, air corps, and

artillery; not some of these soft admirals riding around in their flagships.

It is time Congress asserted its parliamentary power and stopped these admirals interfering with the Secretary of State. The foreign policy of this country is a matter for the Secretary of State to determine, and Secretary Hull is an able and intelligent man who has peaceful intentions. These admirals ought to be told to shut their mouths and keep out of international affairs.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about the respect of the people of the United States for representative government and for the Congress of the United States. We vote huge sums to the Navy and then let the admirals tell us what to do.

And that is not all. Speaking generally, when a bill comes up, we rush it through like lightning, without very much consideration; if any thoughtful amendments are offered, we crush them down, and then it goes to the Senate. For instance: In the extension of the N. R. A., I offered an antitrust amendment—that is, an amendment to enforce the Antitrust Act and to make it so that we could break up these combines and protect the rights of the small merchant—but it was defeated, I will admit, by a very small number, about 15 votes. But when the bill goes to the Senate, they add the antitrust amendment—precisely the amendment I offered and was defeated in the House—and I predict now that we will finally approve it because of the Senate. We jammed the relief bill through in no time, and the Senate took their time and passed numerous amendments, and then we agreed to nearly everything.

Time after time we give up our parliamentary and congressional powers; we forget our rights; and if we forget ours, we forget our duties and responsibilities; then gradually we lose our position of strength in our Government.

Yes; admirals criticize us, and I do not think that it does a great deal of damage. We are not immune to criticism. But when the bitter criticism of an admiral takes the form of contempt for parliamentary government, along with his blatant advocacy of war against a friendly nation, certainly Congress should take cognizance of this and exercise our parliamentary powers in disciplining such actions, and certainly we should provide for the protection of the State Department in its right to have full control of foreign relations. But from a viewpoint of local self-government, of national integrity, from the protection of parliamentary government, we must take cognizance of the tendency of any military or naval man who treats with contempt the representatives of the people. The Government of Germany was defeated because her military men gradually taught the people of Germany to hate the Reichstag, and the Reichstag became impotent, and that was the end of parliamentary government there. The same thing happened in Hungary and has happened in many other countries.

The time has come when Congress should assert itself not only in reference to admirals but to all persons or groups seeking to nullify or take away parliamentary power.

Let me repeat that the subject of communism is wholly irrelevant. There is only one point involved and that is our relations with a friendly nation. Then, if we go into the ramifications of the point, we find our friendly relations being disturbed by an admiral whom foreign countries will believe is talking officially for the President and Congress; we find also the other point which I brought out very thoroughly, and that is the disrespect for parliamentary government.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. If Admiral Stirling had eulogized Russia, or affairs in Russia, would my colleague have castigated him?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes; I would have castigated him because if he had eulogized Russia to the extent of having Russia declare a war on France it would have been a very bad thing, and exactly the same thing that he has done. Certainly I would have castigated him. The point of the matter is Russia is a government which is on friendly terms with the United States Government and it is none of an

admiral's business to stick his nose in foreign relations. The question is not Russia's form of government but of contemptuous assumption by a member of the naval forces of the functions of the State Department which is absolutely none of his business.

Mr. BLANTON. Just one other question: If there should be—and God forbid it—an attack on our country from some eastern power would not my friend from San Antonio be dependent largely on Admiral Stirling and other admirals as a first line of defense?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes; just exactly like I would be dependent on the police department of San Antonio to defend me; but I do not want the police department to be settling the policies of Texas. That should be done by the legislature and the proper sections of the State. I want protection from the police, not nosey and presumptuous lectures on subjects they know nothing of. I want the same from admirals; and if Admiral Stirling had a decent respect for the State Department he would discontinue infringing on their authority. An admiral is no more than a dignified policeman—in this case an undignified one—and he should keep his mouth shut and do what he is told.

The basis of discipline in an army, and I presume also in a navy—and an admiral is supposed to understand discipline, at least as much as a doughboy private—is to keep one's personal opinions out of the policies of the Nation, and do your duty unflinchingly. A military man who is patriotic follows the beacon light of duty and does not whine, cry, argue, and debate, nor try to get our boys killed in a war.

Mr. HOEPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOEPEL. My memory may be somewhat hazy, but if I recall correctly, Admiral Sims, prior to our entering the World War, made a speech at a banquet in London which had as its intent to bring the United States into the World War.

Mr. MAVERICK. I do not know about that. Lately, that particular admiral, now retired, has made some intelligent statements on the subject of neutrality. I believe the position of a retired officer is different from that of one on active duty. Admiral Stirling is on active duty, as an officer of the Navy; he is not an officer of the State Department. That is the distinction I draw.

Mr. Speaker, when we get on the subject of war, I have a hope that some day all of the archives of the various governments, including our own, will be fully opened to the public. I understand there exist certain documents—in fact, I know that they do exist—in which various officials regret very much to state that Mr. Morgan and the private bankers could not handle the debt to the allied governments any more, and that the Government of the United States would have to come in and take these debts over and enter the war. This has happened before, and the point that I make clear is that if we are going to stay out of war, if we are going to stay out of trouble, it is no business of the hired hands of the Government to go completely outside of their duties attempting to make policies for Congress and the President of the United States. We are supposed to make those policies; the admirals are not supposed to. And if an admiral, in active service of the Government of the United States, is constantly writing articles and agitating his subversive ideas, advocating war—a war in which he will not have to suffer at all—it certainly will have an effect on our international relations because foreign countries believe that the admiral must be speaking with the authority of Congress and the President of the United States. We cannot let a thing like that go unchallenged.

Mr. HOEPEL. I should like to state that, in my opinion, admirals are good propagandists and lobbyists for the Steel Trust.

Mr. MAVERICK. When the Nye-Clark Munitions Committee report is finally made public, and the American people really know all the facts which will be brought out, it will shock the Nation.

Under unanimous consent, and in order that the Record be made clear and that no isolated paragraphs be used

against Admiral Stirling, I herewith offer the full article printed Sunday, June 9, 1935, in the Washington Herald:

EUROPE, RIFE FOR STRIFE, FACES MENACE OF RUSSIAN RED FORCES, WARNS STIRLING—"SOVIET IS PREPARING FOR WAR WITH MILLIONS TRAINED TO FOMENT WORLD REVOLUTION"

(By Rear Admiral Yates Stirling, Jr., Commandant Brooklyn Navy Yard, formerly Commander United States Naval Base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii)

The political situation in Europe today is so complicated and confusing that it seems well-nigh impossible to grasp and analyze it as a concrete whole. It appears most baffling, even to the veteran students of the shifting sands of European politics.

Basically, the main cause of this vast unrest is economic. Some of it, doubtless, is the result of restrictions put upon Germany, Austria, and Hungary by the Versailles Treaty, and the failure of the League of Nations to administer the treaty and carry out all its exacting functions.

Germany and Japan now stand aloof from the League. France considers her security has been threatened by the announced rearming of Germany. She has turned to Soviet Russia and negotiated with the Soviet a pact for mutual assistance.

Great Britain once again is in her historical role of peacemaker.

THREE AND ONE-HALF MILLION MEN UNDER ARMS

Europe is an armed camp. Nearly three and a half million men are under arms, backed by over 9,000 war airplanes, ready to fly across frontiers and sow destruction in enemy's territory.

Rearmed Germany appears to stand alone in Europe and believes herself faced by the threat of violence, not only from the west but also the east.

Against such an array of force it would seem impossible for Germany to consider war. Her new army of six hundred and odd thousand effectives and her 1,500 war airplanes could be no match against the rest of Europe's armies of nearly 3,000,000 men, ready to strike, backed by over 6,000 airplanes, to say nothing of over 2,000,000 tons of warships.

We have been told that world unrest today primarily is the result of the unequal division among the nations of the essentials of industry—raw materials, cotton, rubber, iron, oil, nickel, lead, wool, coal, steel, copper, tin, wheat, and many other articles needed by factories in the production of goods.

Germany and Italy in Europe, with rapidly increasing populations, are almost destitute of many of these raw materials within their borders. They have embraced an autocratic form of government and are feverishly training their citizenry in the arts of war.

The unbalanced, explosive situation of Europe today, in fact, of the world, may undoubtedly be said to be greatly aggravated by the existence of bolshevism in Russia.

Russia has, to all intents and purposes, withdrawn a fertile and populous land over 8,000,000 square miles in extent, with a population of 165,000,000 from the usual economic intercourse with the world. This has upset the delicate economic balance of Europe.

The Russian Soviet Republics sprawl across the map of Europe and Asia from the Baltic to the Pacific Ocean, extending from longitude 30 degrees east to longitude 180 degrees east, with an average depth of 35 degrees of latitude.

This vast area contains 16 percent of the world's land area. The soil of Russia is fabulously rich in minerals and can be used to develop all manner of raw materials for which the world is now hungering.

Russia's yearly production in raw materials today in percentages of world production bulk large:

Cotton, 8 percent; iron, 16 percent; coal, 6 percent; oil, 12 percent; copper, 4 percent; steel, 12 percent; wool, 4 percent, and wheat, 21 percent.

Yet Russia's trade with the outside world is but 2 percent of the world's trade. The impounding of these essential materials and the methods used in their production in the last 18 years has been a factor in the present economic situation.

The cornerstone of communism in Russia is to "guarantee the dictatorship of the proletariat for the purpose of suppressing the bourgeoisie" (Soviet Constitution.)

The words of Lenin, whose body is now enshrined in a magnificent tomb in the Red Square in Moscow, were: "Our task—world revolution. Direct assistance must also be rendered to the revolutionary movements among the dependent nations or those without equal rights in the colonies. We must have leaders, who, in respect to the bourgeoisie feel nothing but mortal hatred, who do not hesitate to use the most violent means toward those who stand in the way."

REICH CONVINCED SOVIET A PLOTTER

These are none too cheering words to Germany and the other nations of the world whose economic security is built upon capitalistic principles and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, nor to those nations whose resources of raw materials and man power are locked up in their dependencies and colonial possessions.

Germany seems convinced that Soviet Russia is a threat to the political integrity of the nations of Europe and a deliberate plotter against their economic recovery.

Soviet Russia is said to have trained 12,000,000 men and women for the world revolution; that is the avowed aim of the Third International. The Soviet Army is modern and well equipped with all the new instruments of war. The Soviet air forces and the tank corps are the boast of Moscow. On May 1 it is reported that 2,000 tanks and 3,000 war planes were displayed in Russia.

Russia is preparing for war! Is it an offensive or defensive war in Russia's mind? Her outspoken leaders glory in her isolation. They point with unconcealed pride to the declared fact that they are proving that only a Soviet State can make itself self-sufficient and independent of the products of other nations. The capitalistic nations, they declare, must draw their life blood from outside economic contacts.

FEELS SHE'S BULWARK AGAINST COMMUNISM

Germany insists that her rearmament is not against France but for security against Russian communism. She declares herself to be the bulwark against a fully armed Russia. She fulminates that blinding oneself to a nation whose first precept of government is the overthrow of all other governments on earth is a most dangerous venture, no matter what the temporary advantages of an alliance with a nation of unlimited resources and man power. She condemns Great Britain and France for supporting Russia and walking into the spider web of communism.

Soviet Russia remains an important, if not the most vital, factor in any plan for the stabilization of Europe, yet the doctrines of bolshevism ever remain a menace to all capitalistic nations.

Will the rest of Europe divide against itself and give Russian propaganda an opportunity to drive a Red wedge between the divisions?

Maybe, at the same time, letting in a Red army and air force, trained and equipped, an avalanche, carrying in every knapsack the seeds for the undoing of the capitalistic world.

Germany appears to be planning for the day when Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Italy will stand with her, a wide and united barrier against communism, a barrier bristling with bayonets from the Baltic to the Mediterranean.

REDS IN CHINA IRK JAPANESE

Japan in the Far East is finding the red tide in China most inconvenient, and Germany can count on her to keep occupied or immobilized a Red army in the Russian eastern provinces.

France and the Little Entente (Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Rumania) were united against Germany. If Germany can make Europe believe that her rearming is against Russia, and that Russia is a great danger, might not the Little Entente fly asunder and realign itself with Germany against a common enemy—communism? Where then would be the Franco-Russian Pact?

Europe today seems ripe for strife. Can these great armies, fully panoplied, be effaced without war? Will the full force of this universal desire for conflict be expended in a fratricidal war in Europe? Or may we not look for a united front against communism?

COMMAND OF SEAS BALANCE OF POWER

Will a leader appear who will have the eloquence, appeal, and driving power to bind together these discordant nationalities and set the armed forces marching under a single banner?

Germany, in such an alliance, must become the great organizer and industrial producer. In her factories the instruments of war on a colossal scale could be turned out.

The resources of the world can be assured to such an alliance only through the command of the seas. This would be obtained should Great Britain throw in her sword on that side. With the seas open for trade, the American markets could not be expected to remain closed.

In the guise of such a great crusade, maybe yet inarticulate in men's thoughts, cannot one see the outlines of a daring plan, not only forever laying the ghost of bolshevism but for opening up the fertile lands of Russia to a crowded and industrially hungry Europe?

This article should be closely studied. The insidious advocacy of war runs through the whole article. This article will at least show, in the permanent record, what our admirals are saying and thinking—that is publicly—and privately no one knows how much further they go, nor how much money they got for these activities.

Mr. Speaker, I get sick of hearing about communism and I think that what Congress ought to do is to make the necessary legislation to preserve this country. We are not going to accomplish anything by violence ourselves, or by evading issues. Communism as such has no part in this speech and is not a part of the subject matter. However, several articles have appeared in the Daily Worker for the past few days, starting Sunday, June 9, and then the 10th, 11th, 12th, and today, which is the 13th. On Wednesday, June 12, there appears a long article with a headline like this:

Admiral openly backs vigilante terror; attacks the Jews and condones Hitler; Capitol seeks to dodge responsibility.

Then, another headline:

Says he was forced to speak at Nazi rally by Washington—supports Hitler.

I do not know whether any of this is true. The article is rather long and, therefore, I do not include it in the

RECORD. However, I have asked for an investigation of the statements of Admiral Stirling; I have suggested that the State Department take charge of foreign relations and, if we really want to find the truth, we ought to have an investigation to set these matters straight. There is one way to down a controversy. If the Daily Worker is not telling the truth, then they can be prosecuted and sued for libel. In any event, with all of the statements and all the fuss stirred up by this admiral, something certainly should be done. We should not stand mute and let an admiral be the beginning of leading us into war.

I likewise offer various and sundry other quotations from the Daily Worker:

On Monday, June 10, 1935, Major General Graves is quoted as saying:

From my observation of Russian affairs ever since I was in the Far East in 1918, I can say that as far as I can see, there is no justification for a war against the Soviet Union.

Graves, in his book America's Siberian Adventure, published in 1931, created a sensation with his exposure of the fact that the "atrocities" attributed to the Bolsheviks, actually were committed by Kolchak and other White Guard generals whom the United States was supporting at the time with troops and money.

In the same article, it also says:

LEGION MEMBER SCORES ATTACK

Thomas J. Sullivan, former lieutenant commander in the United States Navy, and a member of the Elmhurst American Legion Post 298, told the Daily Worker:

"It is most unbecoming that a naval officer of high rank, in an active-duty status, should advocate a ganging up of nations to wage war against a friendly power merely because that power has vast natural resources which, it appears, are not being exploited for profit. This officer in the past has called for war with Japan to curb that nation's ambitious program in China. Yates has about reached the retirement age, and it is our experience that admirals at that age become exceedingly bloodthirsty. The necessity for prompt disciplinary action is evident."

The following appears in The Nation of June 19, 1935:

Naval and Army officers on active duty should be forbidden to write or speak publicly about international affairs unless in their official capacities they are interpreting the views of the Government. Otherwise foreigners will read official importance into what may be sheer personal ignorance or prejudice. Rear Admiral Yates Stirling, Jr., commandant of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, in the New York American of June 9 gives a picture of the European situation which may express the ideas of Hitler, but does not, we trust, reveal those of the President. Though he writes with less sensationalism than Mr. Hearst likes from his contributors on this theme, Admiral Stirling finds Russia the chief obstruction to recovery in Europe, comments sympathetically on Germany's belief that it is the bulwark against communism in Europe, and anticipates the coming of a united front under Germany's leadership. "Russia has, to all intents and purposes", he says, "withdrawn a fertile and populous land of over 8,000,000 square miles in extent, with a population of 165,000,000, from the usual economic intercourse with the world. This has upset the delicate economic balance of Europe." This is a new interpretation of the depression; 2 years ago Russian "dumping" was one of the causes. It will strike the Russians with some irony after their meager success in borrowing foreign capital. Writing of the German dream to line up the world against Russia, Admiral Stirling concludes with the question: "In the guise of such a crusade, cannot one see the outline of a daring plan, not only for laying forever the ghost of bolshevism but for opening up the fertile lands of Russia to a crowded and industrially hungry Europe?" If that is how the European struggle looks to the admiral, his superiors at Washington should send him some non-German reading matter. But whatever his opinions, he should resign from Government service before airing them.

Also, I offer an article from the New York Herald Tribune of June 11, 1935, and this is to give all angles in the case. I have tried, as much as possible, to give quotations from all parts of the national press and this can be the basis of an investigation. The Herald Tribune is a Republican paper, but an excellent newspaper. Let us get all the truth. The article is as follows:

STIRLING DRAWS HOUSE FIRE FOR ARTICLE ON REDS—ADMIRAL'S PLAN FOR WAR ON SOVIET BRINGS THREAT OF CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRY—RUSSIAN EMBASSY SILENT—STATE DEPARTMENT DISAVOWS OBSERVATIONS OF OFFICER

WASHINGTON, June 10.—Rear Admiral Yates Stirling, Jr., commandant of the New York Navy Yard, was under fire from three Members of the House today and a Congressional investigation was threatened as the result of an article written by the naval officer suggesting that an international alliance for a war on Russia and Bolshevism was possible, and that American markets would be open for the support of such an enterprise.

In addition to the threats from Capitol Hill, the State Department disavowed the observations of the admiral, and the Navy Department was quietly making an investigation. The Russian Embassy had not taken cognizance officially of the article.

"These are the personal statements of the admiral," the State Department said. "They do not in any way represent the views of the Government of the United States."

The Congressional fire against Admiral Stirling also was intensified by a demand upon President Roosevelt from the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom that he dismiss him because he "had implied a war against Russia would be wise and advisable."

Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, Republican, of New York, announced he was introducing a resolution tomorrow in the House under the title of "What Price Patriotism." It would call upon the Naval Affairs Committee to find out how much money the officer received for his article. The Representative said he was also studying Navy regulations to determine if he would be justified in calling upon the Secretary of the Navy for disciplinary action.

"What kind of government Russia has is her own business," Mr. MARCANTONIO declared. "We recognized her, and she is therefore to be considered a friendly nation."

Representative BYRON N. SCOTT, Democrat of California, supported by Representative MAURY MAVERICK, Democrat, of Texas, announced he would introduce two resolutions tomorrow. One requests the House Naval Affairs Committee to investigate whether the admiral was trying to participate in the formation of diplomatic policy. The other calls on the House Foreign Affairs Committee to inquire into the implications of the speech, State Department policy, and the role of admirals in foreign relations.

The admiral's article, published in Hearst newspapers, cited bolshevism as in Russia as exaggerating the "unbalanced, explosive situation of Europe." He declared that Russia was "preparing for war" and said that the Soviets' "impounding" of essential raw materials had upset the "economic balance."

He asked if "a leader" would appear who would bind discordant elements together against Russia. He continued:

"The resources of the world can be assured to such an alliance only through the command of the seas. (This would be obtained should Great Britain throw in her sword on that side.) With the seas open for trade, the American markets could not be expected to remain closed."

"In the guise of such a great crusade, maybe yet inarticulate in men's thoughts, cannot one see the outlines of a daring plan, not only forever laying the ghost of bolshevism, but for opening up the fertile lands of Russia to a crowded and industrially hungry Europe."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, William Randolph Hearst is performing one good service to the United States Government, and that is the fight he is making against communism. And because of this good fight he is making, I am constrained to forgive him for many of the evils for which he is responsible. Is there a man on the floor of this House who advocates what is going on now in Russia? If there is, I yield to him, because I want to see the color of his eyes.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman advocate what is going on there now?

Mr. HOEPPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman advocate what is going on in Russia now?

Mr. HOEPPEL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I asked the gentleman if he advocates what is going on now in Russia?

Mr. HOEPPEL. In reference to Russia; yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, the gentleman ought to leave this House; he ought to leave California; and he ought to go to Russia and stay there if that is the case. I do not yield further.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Will the gentleman yield? He did not get my question.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOEPPEL. I should like to say that I attended a banquet recently where Mr. Gannett, publisher of the Gannett newspapers, was the principal speaker, and he stated, as I understood it, that there is more democracy in Russia today than in any other nation in Europe except England. I am merely quoting Mr. Gannett.

Mr. BLANTON. If Mr. Gannett loves democracy as I do, and he thinks that way about it, he ought to quit the United

States and go to Russia. May I make this suggestion to those who are always preaching Russia and who are at least sympathetic toward communism. Why do you not go where communism exists if you believe in it and do not like this country? If you do not like the country of Washington and Jefferson and the country of democracy go somewhere else where you think conditions are better.

Now, may I say also that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] is a good soldier. He is just a little effervescent. He is just "popping off" here every day; but do not get the wrong idea about the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK]. He comes from one of the best families in the United States and nothing bad should come from the loins of his progenitors. This is just a wild whirlwind he has got himself into. Do not get the wrong impression about him. Wait until he is here a little while and settles down and you will find that he will become one of the most substantial and dependable men in this House. Just wait until he adjusts himself.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAVERICK. I just want to say that I hope the House will not get a bad impression of my colleague from Texas, Mr. BLANTON, either.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am getting tired of hearing American statesmen in the American Congress get up here and give aid and comfort to, and preach sympathy for the infamous Communists who are now trying to disrupt every government on the face of the earth. I am not going to lend aid and encouragement to such enemies of good government.

If I had my way about the matter—and I hope Congress will make provision for it before we adjourn—no Communist Party would ever again have their name on any ticket in any election in the United States. [Applause.] Why, if they believed in orderly government of any kind, it would be all right. If they believed in some form of orderly government, it would be all right. But they do not believe in order; they do not believe in law; they do not believe in a constitution; and they do not believe in government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will not advocate the taking away of the privilege of the ballot from the Farmer-Labor Party.

Mr. BLANTON. Not unless they get mixed up with the Communist Party.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have a half minute—

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind you colleagues again about Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman. During the war they were two of the most notorious anarchists in history. We spent thousands of dollars to deport them and send them to Russia. They stayed there a while and sent back word to the United States over their signatures that they would rather spend the rest of their days in a penitentiary in the United States than to live free in Russia.

My God, are there any men in this House who would preach and advocate what is now going on in Russia? I do not ask you to read anything in the Hearst papers except what he is telling you about Russia. [Laughter.] But read what he tells you about Russia. The people there have been deprived of all rights. They are told when to go to bed, when to get up, what to do, and how to do it, and then most of the product of their labor is taken from them. Read the statements that Hearst's representatives have brought back from Russia and they ought to turn every sympathizer in this House into a unanimous and concerted fighter against communism and against lawlessness and against disorder. [Applause.]

This is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the statements of condemnation of Russia, I want to ask the gentleman from Texas whether Russia is the country which the President of the United States recognized about a year ago?

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are we going to consider bills on the Private Calendar or listen to speeches all the afternoon?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to any more speeches.

Mr. MAVERICK. The gentleman is missing a lot of wisdom. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 7 minutes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8021) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LUDLOW, SNYDER, ZIONCHECK, DOCKWEILER, MORAN, BUCHANAN, and POWERS.

JUDGE OF DISTRICT COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas submitted a conference report on the bill (H. R. 4665) to authorize the appointment of a district judge to fill the vacancy in the district of Massachusetts occasioned by the death of Hon. James A. Lowell.

AMENDMENT TO MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING STAMP ACT

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7982) to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, and certain other acts relating to game and other wildlife, administered by the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 15, after line 13, insert:

"TITLE VII—CONTINUANCE OF APPROPRIATIONS

"That there is hereby appropriated out of the unexpended balance of the sum of \$3,300,000,000 appropriated by the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 274), making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, the sum of \$6,000,000, which shall remain available until expended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire by purchase or otherwise such lands as may be necessary in his opinion adequately to provide for the restoration, rehabilitation, and protection of migratory waterfowl and other wildlife and to erect and construct thereon and in connection therewith such buildings, dikes, dams, canals, and other works as may be necessary; and in the execution of this joint resolution the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such expenditures for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as he shall deem necessary."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES moves to concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows: Strike out the words "joint resolution" wherever they appear therein and insert in lieu thereof the word "act."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CENTRAL STATISTICAL COMMITTEE AND CENTRAL STATISTICAL BOARD

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 249.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 249

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 7590, a bill to create a Central Statistical Committee and a Central Statistical Board, etc. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendments the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend, with or without instructions.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY] 30 minutes. I do not know that there will be much opposition to the rule.

This is a rule to provide for the consideration of H. R. 7590, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Statistical Board and a Statistical Committee. Following the dissolution of the Efficiency Bureau, the President, under authorization from this House, appointed a Statistical Board, a Board to perform the functions of the Board provided for in this bill. That Board will go out of existence on the 16th of June unless this Congress takes some action.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would it not be proper to have this work done under the Bureau of the Census?

Mr. HARLAN. The Bureau of the Census is one of the group taking statistics for the Government. The gentleman from Mississippi, who will explain the bill, will go into that question with greater detail than I can.

The Bureau of the Census has not existing powers sufficiently broad to cover this work. There are a great many types of statistics that are being gathered by different agencies of an entirely different work than that which is done by the Bureau of the Census. The Bureau of the Census will function under this Statistical Board.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean that this bill abolishes the Bureau of the Census and puts it under this Board.

Mr. HARLAN. Oh, no; this is not a board that commands any other governmental agency now operating. It is a coordinating board acting under Executive powers. There will be three members of the Cabinet appointed as a committee that will direct the Board. The purpose of this bill is to give the different bureaus that are overlapping activities in many cases work as a unit, and have one place where Members of Congress can go for information, no matter as to what type of statistics they want—they can go to this one place and get it. It will be a matter of collecting information and avoiding duplication.

Mr. TABER. Would it not be better if we conferred this authority upon some organization already set up?

Mr. HARLAN. It is the continuation of an organization already set up.

Mr. TABER. But it has not been functioning; and how will it in the future?

Mr. HARLAN. I would rather have the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] answer that question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me to answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], this bill provides for continuing the functions of the present Statistical Board, which has been functioning and, according to the hearings before our committee, quite efficiently for the past year and a half, or 21 months.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I was not privileged to attend many of the hearings, I have asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania to take charge of the time. However, I have quite carefully gone into this legislation and I am taking time under the rule to explain some of its main features. I am hesitatingly approving the legislation, knowing that we are already overburdened by too many boards and too much bureaucracy. This, however, is simply carrying on emergency legislation, making it permanent for a period of 5 years. I am inclined to think that the administration might, if it would, make good use of this. One of the persuasive arguments that appeals to me is that President Roosevelt has said:

I wish to use this position of high responsibility to discuss up and down the country, in all seasons, at all times, the duty of reducing taxes and of increasing the efficiency of the Government, and of cutting out the underbrush about our Government, and getting the most public service for every dollar.

I am inclined to think that this is an opportunity that we may give him for cutting out a good deal of underbrush. How many of you have read that recent book, *Handout*? Perhaps there may be something in it that will excite your curiosity, even if you do not fully approve of it, or may challenge some of the statements in that book, but we all know that large numbers of employees have been added to practically all departments in gathering censuses and statistics, and, of course, it is high time that these be at least coordinated. Under the National Recovery Act, the President was allowed to set up this Central Statistical Board.

I cannot go into that at length, but any Member of this House can read the hearings and judge of the results claimed by those who compose this Central Statistical Board. The bill does not carry a large amount of money. There is to be a chairman of the Board, and no one seems to be able to speculate as to whom he shall be. He will be appointed by the President and receive a salary of \$10,000 a year. There will be 13 other members, 10 of whom must already be on the pay roll of the United States Government, and they will receive no further salary. Three others may be appointed who are outside the Government at the present time, and they shall receive \$25 a day and expenses. The total amount paid is to be \$180,000, of which all but \$10,000 will be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia. The committee will consist of the secretaries of three departments—the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Agriculture. These three are the principal departments that gather most of these statistics. Amendments may be offered here asking that other Cabinet members be placed on the committee, lest their departments be interfered with. The Department of Justice expressed a little concern lest it may be forced to disclose information that it might not properly disclose.

An important feature of this bill, and it will be challenged, is that it has no teeth in it. Those who came before the committee claim that thus far they did not need to put teeth in it; that every recommendation made by the Board had been accepted in all departments. Therefore they need only to investigate and advise in these matters. There is in the bill, however, authority to advise with and help any statistical service in the United States. That may well be looked into when the bill is read—whether or not we should set up a large department of employees who could go into any part of the country to offer help and advice to any statistical agency.

I might comment on many features of this report, but I do not intend to take the time to do so now.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman says the Commission has been in force about 2 years. How many statistical departments in the various bureaus have been dropped because of that?

Mr. GIFFORD. I cannot answer that, but it would be ridiculous to assume that they have dropped any in this administration. They claim to have brought about coor-

dination in various bureaus doing overlapping work, suggesting better methods, and have brought about much saving in the expense of gathering of statistics.

Mr. SNELL. How many men are gathering statistics in the departments at the present time as compared with 2 years ago?

Mr. GIFFORD. I cannot answer that, because we have not the figures. The gentleman knows that under the F. E. R. A. they have put a lot of people to work gathering statistics on almost everything.

Mr. SNELL. I would be for this Commission if I thought it was going to do anything along the line of decreasing the number of employees in the Government, but if it is going to increase them, then I am opposed to it.

Mr. GIFFORD. The answer to that is that this bill ought to bring about a weeding out of a great many of these agencies which are duplicating agencies. If we have the right man at the head of it, and he is free from executive interference so that he can be independent, I think if he does his duty, he could weed out a tremendous amount of these census-taking things that are now being operated.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is a fair statement from the hearings that already, during the tenure of this Statistical Board, there have been eliminated many duplications.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. I call attention to the fact that in the report, which we do not have time to discuss at this time, there are many statements made showing that they have made real progress. The persuasive argument to me has been that prominent men in the country have indicated they are for it. I will refer to Professor Bullock of Harvard University, who wrote me a letter stating that he has given this bill careful consideration, and he says that for many years this has been a much-desired act of legislation. He comments that when a new department head comes in, all the work of the foregoing department head may be laid aside, new methods are advanced that are perhaps no better than they had before, and often postpone results until too late to be useful.

The State Department related that this agency gathered for them very often figures on the economic conditions of the country that were put over the Navy radio to inform their representatives in foreign countries of the economic conditions in this country. However, we know in recent days that the economic conditions of the country can be and have often been very badly misrepresented.

Mr. Speaker, on the whole, as I said before, while this is an attempt to set up something that we already have under an emergency, I am inclined to believe, and I know that if properly administered, it would do a lot of weeding out and would save a lot of duplication. Therefore, I am constrained to support the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, we have but one other speaker. I prefer that the gentleman from Ohio would use some more of his time.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we shall use any more time on the rule.

Mr. RANSLEY. Then I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill creates a board to have charge of certain statistical operations. It is a board of Cabinet officers. Then it provides for a board of 13 additional members, the chairman of the board to be the chief executive officer, to receive a salary of \$10,000 a year. It provides for appropriating \$180,000.

There is nothing in the world that is worse than the creation of boards. The efficiency of Government is reduced every time a board is created. If we were doing anything that would accomplish anything, I should be for it, but the trouble with this is that it is another board, the creation of a set-up that will just spend a lot of Government money. This kind of a set-up could be just as well established under some Cabinet officer. It could be put under the Department of Commerce, under the Bureau of

the Census, and we would know where every bit of it was and we would know where to go, and we would be able to work out something. But in creating this kind of a board we scatter our fire all over the lot. It becomes perhaps as the old Bureau of Efficiency became, a bureau for the promotion of new activities and larger activities. That is why I do not like to see such a thing as this established.

I am frank to say I had never heard of this organization prior to the time I came into this Chamber today. I am sorry that no one has attempted to explain what it might do. For that reason I cannot say just what I would like to say about it. The whole set-up looks bad, and I hope that the Congress will not go into this sort of thing and create, as an almost permanent proposition, a new organization and a new set-up that will cost a lot of money. Once a new set-up is established, we almost never get rid of it.

Mr. HARLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HARLAN. The gentleman is aware, of course, that it is provided in the bill that the members of the Board, if drawing salaries otherwise under the Government, shall not receive any salary for this activity?

Mr. TABER. Aside from the chairman of the Board.

Mr. HARLAN. And under present conditions, the man who is supervising this thing is an officer in the employ of the Government, Mr. Dickinson, and he will not draw any salary, and the committee members will not draw any salary. The proposition is simply the continuation of a board that already exists. It is not the creation of a new board.

Mr. TABER. There is a general statement that there will be and have been certain accomplishments. There is no specific statement of the accomplishments of this Board which would justify anything in connection with it.

Now, I think that the tendency has been all wrong in going ahead and creating new boards to do things which ought to be done under the general set-up of the Government. I think we ought to go along without setting up this Board with statutory authority.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am just wondering if the gentleman has read the hearings and statements furnished to the committee with respect to the eliminations that have been made and the savings that have been made by this Board since it has been in existence for a year and a half?

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman just mean that?

Mr. HARLAN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. With respect to duplications that have been made by this Board?

Mr. HARLAN. No. I said the elimination of duplications and the economies that have been made as a result of the activity of this Board.

Mr. TABER. I have not had a chance to read them in detail. I do not see how the setting up of a board can accomplish anything. I have always favored having this sort of thing set up under an executive whose business it was to do that sort of thing and not under a board of 15 or 16 members, to divide up authority and prevent in itself efficiency in its operation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I suggest to the gentleman that those who have been connected with the collection of Government statistics advise us that this is the very best board they are able to recommend to the Congress, the very best agency; and I think the evidence supports their statement that it has resulted in economies and has eliminated and especially will eliminate duplication.

Mr. TABER. I would like to hear of some of the duplications that have been corrected, for I have not been able to find any in the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations, and I have followed them pretty closely for the last 12 years.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. Can the gentleman tell me how many employees have been dispensed with by reason of the operation of this Board, or how much money has been saved to

the Federal Government by reason of the operation of this Board up to this time?

Mr. TABER. No; I cannot. I really doubt if there have been any savings, but I am open to conviction.

Mr. HOUSTON. Just an observation there: The different agencies of the Government asked an appropriation of \$16,000,000 in the last year to gather statistics, but through the operation of this Board over \$13,000,000 was saved, as the gentleman from Mississippi just stated, by the elimination of duplication and overlapping of different agencies gathering statistics.

Mr. TABER. I would like to see some of the details of that, because nothing of the sort has been reflected in any of the appropriation bills.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I would like to state to the gentleman from New York that the duplications that were corrected were mostly all under the new set-up in the last 2 years, the new Government organizations; and very little work has been done on the old departments of the Government.

Mr. TABER. Oh, it was a coordination of the activities of the so-called "emergency organizations."

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. TABER. And those items that were paid for out of relief money, so-called, rather than a coordination of the regular governmental activities.

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. TABER. There is no question but that coordination and consolidation are needed. They should have one man at the head instead of a great big board of from 14 to 17; then something would be accomplished.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. Under the authority granted the President, has he not ample power to coordinate any of the regularly established Government bureaus or departments?

Mr. TABER. I doubt if the President had the authority that it would result in very much along that line. I think the authority has about expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It has, absolutely; he has no authority whatever along this line.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield that I may ask a question of the chairman of the committee?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I do not know anything about this bill and I have not had an opportunity to read the hearings. As a general proposition I take the word of the committee that reports a bill and usually vote that way. When a board is set up and they seek further power or authority they usually have a good story to tell. What I want to know is whether or not the hearings disclose any opposition to this board; and, if so, who was heard in opposition?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield that I may reply to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say that, as I understand it, there is no opposition either in the committee or from any source on the outside. I may also say that I am sure the committee, as is the usual custom, considered the bill on its merits and from all angles. We are now considering the rule and not the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to use any more time?

Mr. RANSLEY. No.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield me a few minutes for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. McFARLANE].

Mr. McFARLANE. I should like to know the expense involved in the continuation of this Board.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The bill provides an authorization of not exceeding \$180,000. That is the maximum amount

that has been spent by the Board since it has been in existence.

Mr. McFARLANE. How can the gentleman reconcile the creation of this Board with the pledge in the national Democratic platform to reduce expenses 25 percent, to abolish useless boards, and to stop creating additional boards and commissions?

The 1932 Democratic platform reads as follows on this point:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government, and we call upon the Democratic Party in the States to make a zealous effort to achieve a proportionate result.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I know of no better way to answer the gentleman's question than to point out the economy of creating some agency that will enable the Executive to make those reductions.

Mr. McFARLANE. Have any such reductions been made?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think there have been reductions in the cost of collecting statistics, which is the matter under consideration.

Mr. McFARLANE. What reductions have been made? That is the point I am coming to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be very glad to discuss that when the bill comes up for consideration. I call the gentleman's attention to one particular request enlisting the services of this Board which has been in existence only during the emergency. The Board was requested to pass upon the advisability of an application from the Department of Agriculture for a farm-housing survey for the expenditure of around \$11,000,000 to promote better housing in the United States. I am not saying that this Board is entitled to credit for the reduction, but as a result of the studies of this Board only \$1,000,000 was spent instead of \$11,000,000 for this survey in the United States.

That is but one instance. I shall be very glad to enlarge on this further when we dispose of the rule and take up the bill for consideration.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HAMLIN].

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have attended punctually the meetings held in reference to this bill. I have heard it discussed thoroughly from all standpoints. I have heard the Members who are committee members speak in reference to this matter, and without serious objection the bill has been agreed to by the committee, and they believe that it will save money and will not result in additional expenditures. This will simply give the sanction of Congress to this committee. All of the members of the Cabinet who have spoken have asked for this measure. I am thoroughly in favor of the bill as a matter of economy, efficiency, and of good democracy. [Applause.]

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7590) to create a Central Statistical Committee and a Central Statistical Board, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7590, with Mr. RANKIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration provides for the creation of a central statistical committee and a central statistical board to plan and promote the improvement, development, and coordination of

and the elimination of duplication in statistical services carried on by or subject to the supervision of our Federal Government, and, so far as may be practicable, of other statistical services in the United States.

Those who do the work contemplated by this legislation are experts and economic advisers trained in economics and in statistics. These experts in statistics and economic advisers are not only important in the work of the Government, but they are exceedingly important in business, in commerce, and in banking. There are many statistical agencies in the Government of the United States. In the very nature of things it is important for the various executive departments to have power and authority to provide statistics for the use of their departments and for the use of the public. Business men and business institutions rely upon the statistics furnished by the Government in the conduct of their business. Farmers throughout the Nation look to statistical reports furnished by the Government in connection with their agricultural pursuits. For more than 25 years there has been a need for just such an agency as contemplated in the pending legislation.

President Theodore Roosevelt created an interdepartmental committee as far back as 1908 to accomplish the purposes contemplated in the act. Upon the declaration of war in 1917 statistical bodies were provided that were necessary in the very nature of the case for the prosecution of the war. As has been suggested in the argument on the rule, we had an efficiency committee, but that was abolished under the act of 1932, the first of our so-called "consolidation acts" passed just before the Hoover administration retired. During the depression and with the large expenditure for the relief of unemployment and to provide for the return of recovery, at once the need for a statistical clearing house was apparent.

There was created under the Budget a Federal Statistics Board in 1931. Its functions were limited so that shortly after the passage of the National Industrial Recovery Act and by virtue of authority vested in the President under the terms of that act, by Executive order a Statistical Board was created. This Board's functions for the first 6 months were largely to examine all of the statistical information submitted to the various emergency agencies by those who desired public expenditures, and, as I stated a few moments ago, among other applications made to the Public Works Administration was an application by the Department of Agriculture for an allotment of approximately \$11,000,000 to make a national survey to determine the farm-housing needs of the Nation. This committee was able to cooperate and to examine the matter, go into statistics already available and, in other words, get to the very root of the problem. As a result, instead of an allotment of \$11,000,000 having been made, an allotment of a million dollars, as I recall, was finally made for this purpose.

By Executive order in 1934 the functions of this Board, having been created under the National Industrial Recovery Act in August 1933, were enlarged to provide for supervising the various statistical agencies of the Government and rendered, as disclosed by the hearings, very efficient service.

Dr. W. W. Riefler, the Economic Advisor of the National Emergency Council was transferred by the third Executive order to this Board. He received a salary of \$10,000 a year as economic advisor to the National Emergency Council, and acted as chairman of the Board. He resigned some time ago and the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Dickinson, has been acting as chairman of this Board, which has been functioning now for something like a year and a half.

The hearings disclosed that the Board has examined some 200 statistical inquiries projected by the various Government agencies and have been of valuable assistance in the statistical work of the Government in addition to providing for economies. Under the terms of the National Industrial Recovery Act this Board will cease to function on June 16, 1935. There was passed the act in 1933, that gave the President the power to regroup and eliminate commissions and bureaus. That was an amendment of a similar act passed in June 1932.

As is well known to the membership of the House, I have advocated efficiency and economy, the elimination of useless bureaus and the elimination of useless commissions. I have advocated this both under Republican and Democratic administrations. Usually the only way that can be done is by conferring that power and authority on the Executive, because I agree with the general statement that it is exceedingly difficult for the Congress or any other legislative body to abolish bureaus and commissions.

This bill provides for a supervising board. There are many important governmental statistical agencies.

We have had legislation session after session to base the currency of the United States very largely upon statistics issued by the Department of Labor, by the price index of some 785 articles. I know of no more important work than the statistical work that is being done by the several agencies of the Government.

I am opposed as much as any man to the creation of additional agencies unless they can accomplish good. It is the province of the Congress of the United States to create such an agency when it can accomplish good, and it is for the Executive to make use of it, and this bill, like any other law, depends for its success upon its administration.

Now, inasmuch as there are cases of duplication in the various statistical agencies of the Government, and inasmuch as those who deal with statistics are experts, so to speak, this bill provides for the creation first of a committee—

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment. I should like first to make and finish a connected statement, and then I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

This bill provides for the creation of a committee of the Cabinet composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce. The Bureau of the Census is in the Department of Commerce. Important statistics, as I have stated, are issued by the Department of Labor. All of us know that in the Department of Agriculture daily, as well as annually, important statistics are issued. Now, the agency is a board operating under the supervision of this committee and under the direction and authority of the President, and this board is to be composed of 13 members. At least 10 of these members are to be officials in the various executive departments that are engaged in the business of collecting statistics for that department, and they are to be brought together under the supervision of a chairman who is to receive \$10,000 a year.

I favor efficiency; I favor economy; but if this bill, legislatively, is to be made effective, the chairman of this Board will be an important official. He will be called upon to deal with Cabinet members, and he should be a man of outstanding prominence and professional competence, so that his opinions will command the respect of Cabinet officers and the respect of those who receive similar salaries engaged in the collection of statistics in all the branches of the Government. It is provided there may be three other members appointed, and while in the actual discharge of their duties they are to receive \$25 a day.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for a question at this point?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has made the statement there are duplications in the gathering of statistics. I wonder if the gentleman would now tell us about some of those duplications.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I cannot go into the details, but I may refer the gentleman to pages 45 and 170 of the hearings and the statements of those who appeared before our committee, and the report of the Board, and I will also repeat, for the benefit of the gentleman from New York, what I said a few moments ago that for the first 6 months' period of its existence this Board was engaged primarily in undertaking to coordinate the emergency work. There was not the opportunity, and there has not been during its period of existence, the opportunity or the time, because of

the tremendous expenditures that we have made to promote employment for this Board, to go into the matter of the elimination of duplications, such as the hearings indicate could be done. As a matter of common knowledge, you and I and others receive reports from various executive agencies of the Government and from various Cabinet departments that are in a measure duplications. This bill provides that in the future operations of this Board, these duplications, largely, may be eliminated. The work, information, and important economies of the Board are set forth in the hearings, and especially the report of the Board, pages 121 to 128, and 128 to 140, inclusive, of the hearings.

The bill provides that the employees, largely, as I say, experts, with, of course, clerical help, under the Board that now exists and that will automatically expire in June, upon taking competitive tests, may be covered into the classification service.

The powers of this Board are set forth in section 5 and are as follows:

(a) At the request of the President or the committee, or may of its own motion, investigate and make recommendations with respect to any existing or proposed statistical work carried on by an agency of, or subject to the supervision of, the Federal Government.

(b) Have the power, with the consent of the agency concerned, to investigate and make recommendations with respect to any existing or proposed statistical work carried on by any agency in the United States other than the agencies specified in subsection (a) of this section.

According to the hearings, many business institutions furnish the Bureau of the Census with information which ought to be kept confidential, without being generally circulated, and in the collection of statistics in the Department of Justice respecting crime there are many statistics that are not available to the public and ought not to be available and by special law are not available at times. This information, in order to detect crime, particularly in the Department of Justice, must be retained by that Department and not promulgated by this Board or by any other agency of the Government, and for this reason your committee has suggested an amendment to paragraph c, providing:

That this subsection shall not be construed to require or to make lawful any disclosure of confidential information when such disclosure is specifically prohibited by law.

The committee also recommends an amendment that this agency be limited to an existence of 5 years. Our thought was that this would be a spur to greater efficiency. As a matter of common knowledge, we know that there must be, in the very nature of the case, many duplications in the matter of the collection of statistics in the Government that can be eliminated by the work of this Board, and for this reason it was the judgment of the committee that the functions of the Board should be limited to 5 years.

I may say here that it has been suggested that this Board might have been placed under the Bureau of the Census.

A moment's reflection will convince one that such action would be unwise. The whole purpose is to supervise all departments, and for that reason I think it would be unwise for any existing department to act as a supervising agency for all.

Now, it was suggested that there should be teeth in this act. The powers of the Board are advisory and directory rather than mandatory. In the very nature of things they must be advisory and directory and not mandatory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GASQUE. I will yield the gentleman 3 minutes more.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In response to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLISTER] and other lawyers on the committee, suggested that if we undertook to make the powers of this Board, responsible to the President, mandatory, we would interfere with the Executive in the performance of his functions through his Cabinet officers and the interference might be illegal. So we require the Board to make reports to the committee and then the committee will doubtless make reports to the President of the United States. They should be available to Members of Congress. If the President as he

has demonstrated by the creation of the existing Board desires, as he most assuredly does, to economize and eliminate waste and duplication the work of this Board will be of benefit to him in the execution of his policy. The success and benefit of all laws depends more upon their administration than upon their terms. President Franklin D. Roosevelt as a result of his advocacy of the Economy Act became the outstanding statesman of his day.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the statistics collected by this Board be available to Members of Congress?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; through the committee.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will.

Mr. RICH. My colleague made the statement that he wants to eliminate boards. I question in my own mind whether it would not be better to have the committee eliminate overlapping and duplication rather than trying to have it put up to the President.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This was the best possible agency we could devise. If we undertook to make it mandatory, we would interfere illegally with Executive powers and functions. The Secretary of Agriculture might say that he required certain information, and the Secretary of Labor might maintain that she requires certain information. If the President sees that there is duplication, the President can correct it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, under the leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following report from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

[H. Rept. No. 1084, 74th Cong., 1st sess.]

CREATING A CENTRAL STATISTICAL COMMITTEE AND A CENTRAL STATISTICAL BOARD

Mr. WHITTINGTON, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted the following report to accompany H. R. 7590:

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7590) to create a Central Statistical Committee and a Central Statistical Board, and for other purposes, report the bill with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The hearings conducted on the bill disclosed that for 25 years there has been need for a central coordinating agency for statistical services. In 1908 an interdepartmental committee was appointed to investigate the problem. An effective coordinating agency was established during the World War, but it was subsequently allowed to lapse. The number of Federal agencies engaged extensively in statistical work was already large in 1929. Since that time the number has been materially increased. The Federal Statistics Board, established in 1931, was inadequately equipped. The coming of the depression made the need for a statistical coordinating agency vastly more urgent than it had previously been. Policies toward economic recovery, and for the revival of business activities, brought demands for more extensive and for more economical conduct of statistical work.

The Central Statistical Board was, therefore, by Executive order, and pursuant to authority vested in the National Industrial Recovery Act, established by the President on July 27, 1933, and by Executive amendatory orders on May 4, 1934, and April 8, 1935, the powers of the Board were enlarged and the office of the economic adviser to the National Emergency Council was transferred to the said Board. The regular expenditures made, and the estimated expenditures to be made, for the year ending June 30, 1935, by the Board, and by other agencies for the Board, aggregate approximately \$180,000.

The Central Statistical Board during substantially the 1½ years of its existence has rendered valuable service in the coordination, improvement, and economical operation of the statistical services of the Government. During the first 6 months after its establishment, of necessity, it was occupied by problems of emergency nature which were referred to it by Federal statistical agencies demanding urgent attention. For the past 12 months, in addition to handling said problems, the Board has devoted itself in an advisory capacity in planning and promoting the improvement, coordination, and economical conduct of statistical work. It has taken the initiative in devoting itself to problems for the long-range development and improvement of statistical services. As a result of reviewing statistical problems that have been submitted by other Federal statistical agencies important economies have been effected by the elimination of unnecessary inquiries, and duplicate inquiries have been avoided by the coordination of mailing lists.

More careful planning of inquiries has been encouraged and better information has been obtained.

The comparability of data collected by different agencies and of their classifications has also been improved.

The problem of coordination and the improvement of statistics is a continuing one. The Board was created by Executive order under the National Industrial Recovery Act as an emergency agency and will cease to function on June 16, 1935. The progress that has been made in the coordination and improvement of statistical work warrants a statutory authorization for the continuance of the services heretofore rendered by the Board. The bill under consideration is to provide for such a board, inasmuch as the President is without authority by Executive order to create or continue the Board, or a similar organization.

ANALYSIS

The bill provides for the creation of a board to consist of a chairman to be appointed by the President, with not to exceed 13 additional members, 10 of whom shall be persons already in the service of the United States. All of the executive departments provide for statistics, and the plan is that the representatives from the executive departments trained in statistical work shall be members of the board. The chairman will be the executive officer, and inasmuch as members of the board are technically trained in statistics, economics, and public administration, and inasmuch as the board is empowered to advise and inform executive departments respecting statistical services, the chairman of the board must be a man of outstanding professional competence. The dignity of the office should merit the respect of the executive heads of the Federal Government and the statisticians in their departments. No additional compensation is to be paid members of the board already employed in the service of the United States.

The board shall have the authority to appoint its employees, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, with provision for the appointment of temporary employees who may pass competitive tests.

An appropriation not to exceed \$180,000 annually is authorized.

The bill provides for a committee to be composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor. It was suggested that other Cabinet members be added to the committee, but it was thought that a smaller committee would be more efficient. The Board is to report to this committee and is to perform such duties as the President or the committee may authorize, and make such reports as the committee may require. The Board is empowered to investigate and make recommendations with respect to any existing or proposed statistical work carried on by any agency of, or subject to the supervision of, the Federal Government. It may require any governmental agency to furnish it information and records. It is empowered to plan and promote the economical operation of agencies in statistical work and the elimination of unnecessary work, both on the part of such agencies and on the part of persons called on by such agencies to furnish information.

While there is no comparable existing organization or agency, it is believed that a limitation on the period of the existence of the agency would result in greater efficiency. The bill provides that it shall cease to exist after the expiration of 5 years.

Inasmuch as the Board deals with the executive agencies of the Government, the powers of the Board are directory and supervisory. In the very nature of the case they cannot be mandatory. Moreover, as the Board performs such duties as the President, or the committee, may authorize, it is believed that the power of the Board would be most persuasive. Duplications will be eliminated and economies will be effected.

FUNCTIONS

The Board will improve statistical information. It will promote economy in statistical work. It will furnish better information. It will eliminate duplications.

Such an agency is needed for the improvement of basic statistical information—

- (1) To make it easier to locate available data on any given subject.
- (2) To provide for the comparability of data compiled by different agencies.
- (3) To plan for and to promote the filling of important gaps in available information either by dependable estimates or by the collection of additional data.
- (4) To establish and maintain high standards of accuracy and honesty in the collection and compilation of statistics.
- (5) To insure giving information as to the limitations and proper uses of available statistical data.
- (6) To encourage greater promptness both in the operation of existing collection services and in the adaptation of these statistical services to changed needs for information.

Again, the statistical agency provided in the bill is needed for the economical conduct of statistical work—

- (1) To prevent unnecessary work and unnecessary duplication of work both on the part of statistical agencies and on the part of those called on for information.
- (2) To promote the interchange of data and of ideas among the several statistical agencies.
- (3) To plan and promote the most effective allocation of statistical work among the several agencies and to facilitate, when appropriate, the joint use of equipment and personnel.
- (4) To spread information concerning and to widen the use of the best administrative practices, methods of work, and labor-saving devices.

SUPPORT

The President and the Cabinet are in accord with the purposes of the proposed bill. The Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, and the Assistant and Acting Secretary of Commerce

appeared before the committee and submitted constructive statements and arguments in behalf of the legislation. The bill is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, by the Secretary of the Interior, by the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, by the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, by the Director of the Budget, and by the statisticians and economists in charge of the statistical services of the several executive departments.

The bill will provide for the continuation of economic and improved information and for the elimination of duplication, as well as for the coordination of statistical work in the executive departments of the Government.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the members of the committee want to act carefully and intelligently on this subject. I am going to present the picture of this situation, as I think every Member of the House ought to have it before him as he approaches this problem.

This is an attempt to set up a coordinating body in the Government to pass on the statistical operations of the Government.

We are told that it will cut out and eliminate waste. This is, as you will see, if you will follow me for a moment, the setting up and creation of a board for duplication and waste. The expenditures of the Government are supposed to be controlled and recommended to Congress by the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget is supposed to go over the activities of the different departments and commissions of the Government, and to cut out those things which create and bring about duplication and waste. Every time you scatter your fire and create other boards and bodies for the purpose of doing that same thing, you destroy the effectiveness of the Bureau of the Budget. It is supposed to present to Congress a picture of the situation that is before the Government, a picture of the whole Government, so that the appropriations recommended for the different bureaus and departments of Government can be gone over and those things which are bad can be eliminated.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I stated a few moments ago, the functions of the very board that the Budget said was essential to aid it in its activities was transferred to this Board, and its functions are being carried on, and will be continued, and the Bureau of the Budget was one of the first executive agencies of the Government to endorse this bill.

Mr. TABER. Let me tell you what has been done and what is before the Congress right now in connection with the appropriation for the Budget. There is before the Congress at the present time an estimate providing for 2 executive officers and 8 investigators to go into the estimates of the different departments in more detail and coordinate them. This bill simply means a scattering of our fire in connection with possible economy measures. It means that instead of having an effective organization on the part of the Bureau of the Budget to cut down duplications and cross-fire activities, we are going to have a lot more scattering of the fire. This bill itself is a contradiction of the principles which it purports to enunciate. The Bureau of the Budget is the authority which we have set up to do the job. They have the outfit to do it. If we pass this bill we scatter our fire and destroy the effectiveness of that Bureau which has its finger on the purse strings of the Nation, and is able to cut down by cutting down the estimates by refusing the transfers between the bureaus of the Government which would increase the funds for different purposes, and it is entirely destructive instead of constructive. It seems to me that if we are going to give the Bureau of the Budget this extra money and let them go ahead and do what they say they can do if they get it, that we are making fools of ourselves in creating another board which will work independently of the Budget Bureau to accomplish the things which the Bureau of the Budget ought to do itself. That is just what this bill does.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MILLARD. This Central Statistical Board was created by the National Recovery Act.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MILLARD. It was brought about by reason of that act.

Mr. TABER. I suppose by the tremendous duplication of activities that were created under the authority that was given the Executive.

Mr. MILLARD. It was never thought necessary before the N. R. A. was in existence, was it?

Mr. TABER. I suppose that is so.

Mr. MILLARD. And this bill will save the employees under the N. R. A. and will do nothing else.

Mr. TABER. It will do more than that.

Mr. MILLARD. Will it create more jobs?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will permit me to call his attention to the hearings that this committee held, on page 45, to which we were referred by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] when he stated that would show some of the accomplishments of the Board, I think I can convince him of what I say. I shall read some of the items on that page so that the gentleman may see the accomplishments.

Exhibit F. Central Statistical Board.

Regular expenditures by quarters and balance available April 1, 1935.

Skipping the details of the quarters to April 1, 1935, the total expenditures have been \$70,318.18. That is for almost 2 years' activity, which means an average of \$35,000 per year practically. This bill provides for an appropriation of \$180,000 a year, or almost five times what was expended by the Board before, so that it does more than preserve the jobs. It creates more jobs.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I referred the gentleman to page 45, and I should have said that page gave a part of the costs of the Board, instead of the matter of economies and the elimination of duplications. The gentleman will find the work of the Board on pages 121 to 128, and 128 to 140 of the hearings, and I may also say that, instead of the cost being the amount shown on page 45, that is just a part of the cost, which is around \$180,000, as disclosed by the hearings in a letter to our committee dated May 9, 1935, from the Board.

Mr. TABER. Does that mean that the statement on page 45 is not correct?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; it does not. It is correct. I said that was a part of the expenditures, but there have been other expenditures and other agencies that have been paid, not directly by this agency but by other agencies of the Government in the emergency period, that makes the aggregate about \$180,000, and from now on these other agencies will be paid by this Board.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman realize that if the Bureau of the Budget goes into this thing and coordinates it and cuts out the bad activities that accomplishes something, because it reduces the estimates sent up here and enables the Committee on Appropriations to eliminate them, while this operation is just a superimposed overhead and a duplication of activities of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Pardon me for repeating, but I stated that this Board, established by Executive order of the President, supplanted and took the place of the Federal Statistics Board that was under the supervision of the Bureau of the Budget, established by the Budget in 1931, and that it was really a continuation of the work of that Board in this emergency period, so that this is not an entirely new organization.

Mr. TABER. What board did it supplant?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The Federal Statistics Board established by the Bureau of the Budget itself in 1931, no longer functioning, preserved by this Board which will expire in June.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman think it ought to expire and let this job be done by the Bureau of the Budget, and cut out some of these expenditures instead of creating \$180,000 more?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say that Members of the Cabinet, practically without exception, disagree with the gentleman, and recommend the passage of this bill.

Mr. TABER. They generally are in favor of increasing expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

I wish to say to the Membership of the House that H. R. 7590, creating a Central Statistical Board, is a bill presented to the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments for the purpose of perpetuating a committee that was established under Executive Order No. 6225 of the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, July 27, 1933.

In committee we have conducted hearings on this particular bill. The representatives of the various departments were there. The Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Labor were very much interested in being represented on the committee, as is stated in the bill, for they compose the committee under section 2. Other departments were represented as well, and they favored the enactment of this law, but every department that was represented, by either the head of the department or some other representative, wanted the bill to be enacted into law as is, without any authority given to the statistical committee to coordinate or eliminate the statistics that were found in one department, and to be overlapping in another department. They wanted the committee to sit down quietly and reason out with these various departments and try to have them eliminate certain overlapping functions. But every representative that was heard before the committee, who did not represent the head of one of the major departments of Government, wanted to have teeth put into this bill so that if a department was collecting certain data over the country and they found that another department was collecting similar data, then this committee could say to either department A or department B, "You are collecting data in your department, and department B is collecting very similar data to yours, and you should eliminate the work you are doing and accept the recommendations or data that is collected by the other department." They should enforce their findings.

As I say, every individual who was not directly representing a department said that the committee should have the power to ask one of the major departments to eliminate that excess work, as it were, thus cutting down the costs of government in gathering this data, and trying to coordinate the work so that it would be less expensive and less burdensome to the taxpayers of this country.

I want to call attention to one individual who represents a department. He has been a good Democrat for 35 years. He said that the bill will never function properly unless we have authority in the statistical committee to eliminate this duplicate work by enforcing their orders. I agree with him thoroughly. I think he was one of the most conscientious men who appeared before the committee, and I had hoped that we might add to the bill as proposed the power or authority that this Statistical Board might have in causing departments to eliminate undue and unnecessary statistical gathering work in the Government.

I want to insert in the RECORD at this time the personnel of this old Board. I want to show you the salaries that the members of this Board are receiving.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert this statement in the RECORD at this point as a part of this proceeding.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PRIMARY STAFF CENTRAL STATISTICAL BOARD

Leonard P. Adams, associate research assistant, \$3,200: A. B., Alfred University 1928; M. A., Cornell University 1930; Ph. D., Cornell University 1935; graduate and assistant instructor in economics at Cornell University 1928-34, and at Colgate University 1934 to February 1935.

Morris A. Copeland, executive secretary, \$8,000: A. B., Amherst College 1917; Ph. D., University of Chicago 1921; instructor and

professor of economics, Cornell University 1921-27; Brookings Institution 1927-28; member of staff, President's Committee on Recent Economic Changes, 1928; Staff member, Federal Reserve Board 1929; member of Special Advisory Committee on Census of Manufactures 1929; professor of economics, University of Michigan 1930-33; member, Advisory Committee to Secretary of Labor 1933.

Calvert L. Dedrick, associate research assistant, \$3,600: A. B., University of Wisconsin 1924; Ph. D., University of Wisconsin 1933; statistician and lecturer in public health, Wisconsin Anti-Tuberculosis Association 1924-25; instructor in sociology, extension division, University of Wisconsin 1926-30; research assistant, department of sociology, University of Wisconsin 1930-33; Social Science Research Fellow 1933-34.

Samuel J. Dennis, associate research assistant, \$3,600: A. B., Dartmouth College 1928; work on doctorate partially completed; staff member, Harvard Economic Society 1928-32; instructor and tutor, Harvard University 1931-34; associate editor, Review of Economic Statistics 1931-34.

Edward R. Gray, assistant secretary, \$6,000: A. B., Tusculum College 1916; M. A., Harvard University 1921; accountant and auditor, foreign department, Irving Trust Co., New York City 1919-20; assistant professor of economics, Duke University 1929-31; professor of economics, Duke University, 1923-25; Chief, Division of Research and Statistics, Treasury Department 1926-28.

Ludwig Hellborn, assistant research assistant, \$2,600: Degree of "Matura", University of Berlin, Germany, 1924; doctorate partially completed, New York University; staff member Commerz-und-Privat Bank, Berlin, 1923-28; staff member National City Bank of New York, N. Y., 1929-33; economist and statistician for National Federation of Textiles, Inc., 1934-35.

William M. Hoad, research assistant, \$4,000: A. B., University of Michigan, 1927; M. A., University of Michigan, 1930; investment analyst, Union Trust Co., Detroit, 1928-30; instructor in economics, University of Michigan, 1930-33; staff member, committee on Government statistics and information services, 1933-January 1934.

Roger W. Jones, assistant to the executive secretary, \$3,200: A. B., Cornell University, 1928; M. A., Columbia University, 1931; doctorate partially completed; newspaper reporter, 1928; instructor and executive officer Miami Military Academy, 1928-29; staff member Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1929-31; tutor and private research, 1931-December 1933.

Arynness Joy, chief statistician, \$6,000: A. B., University of Washington, 1922; M. A., University of Chicago, 1924; professor of statistics and economics Mount Holyoke College, 1924-28; staff member Division of Research and Statistics, Federal Reserve Board, 1928-December 1933; chief statistician Office of Economic Adviser to the National Emergency Council, December 1933-March 15, 1935; vice president American Statistical Association, 1935.

Hildegard Kneeland, Chief of Economics Division, Bureau of Home Economics, B. A. E., \$5,600: A. B., Vassar College, 1911; Columbia University, University of Chicago, Ph. D.; Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government, 1930; assistant in physics, Vassar, 1911-12; instructor in chemistry of nutrition, University of Missouri, 1914-17; lecturer in statistics, Barnard College, 1918-19; professor and head of department of household economics, Kansas State Agricultural College, 1919-22; Chief of Division of Economics, Bureau of Home Economics, Department of Agriculture, 1923 to date.

Vladimir S. Kolesnikoff, associate research assistant, \$3,600: Graduate Samava College (Russia) Petersburg University; M. S., Columbia, 1929; staff member, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1929-32; Brookings Institute, 1932-34.

William R. Leonard, associate research assistant, \$3,200: A. B., Whitman College, 1926; M. A. Tufts College, 1928; Ph. D. Cornell University, 1934; formerly instructor in economics, Cornell University, 1928-34.

E. R. Lerner, assistant research assistant, \$2,600: A. B. University of Wisconsin, 1932; M. A. University of Wisconsin, 1933; partially completed doctorate; member of research staff, Consumers Advisory Board, N. R. A., and committee on Government Statistics and Information Services, 1933-34.

Howard H. McClure, acting director, Division of Current Business Statistics, \$4,500: B. A. Dickinson College, 1922; M. A. Columbia University, 1925; extensive business experience in field of investment banking, 1925-32; professor, Department of Political Science, Dartmouth College, 1932-34.

Edwin M. Martin, assistant research assistant, \$2,600: A. B. Northwestern University, 1929; graduate work Northwestern, 1929-35; work on doctorate partially completed; formerly teaching assistant, Department of Political Science, Northwestern University, 1933-35.

Ernest F. Randall, junior research assistant, \$2,300: A. B. University of Missouri, 1933; work on doctorate partially completed; graduate assistant, University of Missouri, 1933-35.

Donald C. Riley, associate research assistant, \$3,200; B. S., Wooster College, 1927; M. A., Princeton University, 1928; instructor in economics, Union College, 1928-31; Harvard, 1931-32; Princeton, 1932-33; work on doctorate partially completed; professor of economics, Huron College, 1933-34.

R. F. Schwartz, junior research assistant, \$2,300; George Washington University, 1920-23; statistical experience in public-utility companies, 1921-32, and commercial firms, 1932-33; real property inventory, Department of Commerce, 1933-35.

Dorothy Sells, senior research assistant, \$4,500; A. B., Wellesley College, 1916; M. A., University of Chicago, 1917; Ph. D., London School of Economics, 1923; Bureau of Labor statistics cost-of-living

study, 1919; director of Education for Women, Texas, 1920; International Labor Office, Geneva, 1922-23; Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., research, 1923-25; assistant professor in social economy, Bryn Mawr College, 1924-28; executive secretary, International Vital Interests, New York City, 1929-34; National Labor Relations Board, 1934-35; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1935.

Lewis B. Sims, assistant research assistant, \$2,900; A. B., University of California at Los Angeles, 1932; M. A. (Berkeley), 1933; work on doctorate partially completed at University of Chicago; research assistant, bureau of public administration, University of California (Berkeley), 1932-33; research and teaching assistant, department of political science, University of Chicago, 1933-35; assisted on study of Government-operated enterprises, Panama Canal Zone (winter), 1934; member of research staff, New York State Commission for the Revision of the Tax Laws, 1934-35.

M. F. Thurston, associate research assistant, \$3,600: Assistant in physics, Cornell University, 1908-09; A. B., Cornell University, 1909; research assistant, General Electric Co., 1910-11; teaching in secondary schools, 1911-22; instructor, Cornell University, 1922-27; agent, Department of Agriculture, 1925-27; Ph. D., Cornell University, 1928; special agent, United States Tariff Commission, 1928; associate professor of economics, Albion College, 1928-30; professor of finance, University of Detroit, 1930-32; emergency agricultural assistant, Michigan, 1933; assistant professor of economics, University of Delaware, 1933-34; real property inventory, Department of Commerce, 1934.

H. Haines Turner, associate research assistant, \$3,200: A. B., Swarthmore College, 1930; London School of Economics, 1930-31; Columbia University, 1931-33; work on doctorate partially completed; Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1933-34; research assistant, National Emergency Council, 1934-35.

Elizabeth M. Whitney, librarian, \$2,300: A. B., George Washington University, 1929; assistant librarian, Brookings Institution, 1931-34.

Jean H. Williams, junior research assistant, \$1,800: A. B., University of California (at Los Angeles), 1932; graduate work, University of California, 1932-34; instructor in economics and accounting, University of California, 1932-34 (at Los Angeles).

PRIMARY STAFF, DIVISION OF CURRENT BUSINESS STATISTICS, CENTRAL STATISTICAL BOARD

Ruth Elsner, junior research assistant, \$2,000: A. B., Cornell University, 1932; M. A. Columbia University, 1934; study of textile industry, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1934.

Richard L. Funkhouser, assistant statistician, \$2,900: A. B., Dartmouth College, 1930; M. A., Princeton University, 1934; instructor in preparatory school, 1930-32.

David Jones, junior economist, \$2,600: A. B., Columbia College, 1932; A. B., honorary, Cambridge, England, 1934; real property inventory, 1934; assistant statistician, Coded Industries Section, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1935.

Grace W. Knott, research assistant, \$3,200: George Washington University, 1921-30 (intermediate); assistant chief of Industrial Marketing Section, Census Bureau, 1930-32; research assistant to David Friday, study on capital formation, 1932-33; National Bureau of Economic Research, continuation of study under Simon Kuznets, 1933; associate statistician, Current Statistics Section of Division of Research and Planning, National Recovery Administration, 1933-35.

Frederick S. Miller, technical assistant to the director, \$2,900: A. B., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., 1922; graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1922-23; law school, 1923-26; active legal practice, 1926-30; business and investment management, 1930-35.

Peter M. Rouzitsky, assistant research assistant, \$2,900; University of Cincinnati, degree in commerce and engineering, 1928; American University, Washington, D. C., 1930; junior statistician in New York engineering firm, 1928; regional expert on foreign trade, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1928-33; scientific aide, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, 1933-35.

Andrew Stevenson, associate research assistant, \$3,600: A. B., Wooster, Ohio, 1926; M. A., Yale University, 1928; Ph. D., Yale University, 1930; extensive business experience in the fields of transportation, utilities, and general corporate finance, 1925-27 and 1932-34; associate professor of economics at Kalamazoo College, Mich., 1929-32.

Mr. RICH. All of the representatives now in this Statistical Board are given as college men, giving the name of the university and the year of graduation and the degree they hold. It also contains information giving to the House the salaries that are being paid to those individuals. There are not on this Board any practical men who have had experience in gathering data, outside the experience they have gained here as members of this Board. Their average age is less than 30 years. They do not have old, conservative individuals with a desire to try to force the various committees to eliminate duplication in gathering statistics. I hope that when the Board is formulated permanently, if that be the desire of the House of Representatives in passing this bill, that this committee that is appointed by the President of the United States, will cause the departments to eliminate all duplication.

The Secretary of Labor, Miss Perkins, appeared before our committee and recommended that the committee be

small in number. She stated why certain information would be necessary in gathering data in assisting her Department.

We had a request from the Treasury Department and a request from the Attorney General to add their Departments to this committee. I asked Miss Perkins a pertinent question, she having stated that this committee should be small, if she would not give up the position that the Secretary of Labor should have on the committee and permit us to put on one of the other departments. Well, that simply displayed to the membership of our committee what you do when you try to eliminate anything that is functioning in their own department. They will not give it up. Miss Perkins was no exception. She said that her work was so important, and I believe she thought that by being on the Board she might influence the committee to the extent that she could probably keep in her Department the fact-finding data that she now has and that she did not want it interfered with, even if the data might be available in another department.

So, as Representatives of Congress, we find that once a department establishes a bureau it remains always. We cannot get rid of it; and when we establish a new department or a new bureau the question in our minds is, will we ever be able to get rid of it? This commission can be of real service, if it will, to coordination of duties and a saving to the taxpayers of the country if it functions properly and in a good business way.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, because of the fact that we do not want to establish additional bureaus, I have always believed that if I could not get a full meal I better take a sandwich. I shall go along with the committee on the bill solely because a provision has been inserted to the effect that if this board cannot show within 5 years that it is worthy of continuation that it will automatically go out of business. For this reason and this reason solely am I supporting this bill. I do not believe it will function as it should, although I can say to the Membership of the House, and to the Republican Members as well as the Democratic Members, that if this committee is composed of men who are really, honestly, and conscientiously desirous of trying to eliminate these duplications, and if they will go to the President of the United States with the determination to hammer and hammer and hammer until the departments give up the work they recommend, then it will be worth while. For this reason I am in hopes that the board will do a good job if it is ever established, and I have confidence, almost, that it will be established, because the administration is back of this measure. My hope is that the board will strive earnestly and conscientiously to do a real good job once it is established.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman has there the salary list of the existing set-up. What are the top salaries?

Mr. RICH. The chairman of the board receives \$10,000. The associate research assistant receives \$3,200. The executive secretary receives \$8,000, and another associate research assistant \$3,600, and others of various amounts. See list.

Mr. LUDLOW. What is the total of the salary list?

Mr. RICH. I do not have the total salary list. It is not recapitulated.

Mr. LUDLOW. What is the gentleman's recollection of the total salary list?

Mr. RICH. They figure that it cost a year ago to administer this function about \$190,000. The committee saw fit to reduce that to \$180,000. Thus, the committee cut down the request of the statistical board.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. GRISWOLD. The gentleman is mistaken in the \$190,000 figure for last year. It is my understanding that \$190,000 represented the greatest expense. The total for last year was approximately \$100,000.

Mr. RICH. If I am not correct, I wish to be corrected, for I do not want to misquote anybody; but I understood from the Secretary when he presented the figures that the cost was about \$190,000 a year.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield, I may say in response to the request of the gentleman from Indiana that the salaries are governed absolutely by the Classification Act. This basis of salaries is recited in the bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. As a matter of fact, if as my colleague from Indiana says, the salaries have been running \$100,000 a year and the bill specifies an authorization for personnel of \$170,000, there is an increase of \$70,000. I am wondering how anyone could justify the creation of this new bureau with this additional expense.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is for the entire expenses of the board.

Mr. LUDLOW. In the District of Columbia?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. The entire service is in the District of Columbia.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I was rather interested in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi in which he said that if there were an economical administration this board could be a very efficient factor. I believe I quote the gentleman from Mississippi correctly when I say that he referred to an administration of economy as a necessary precedent to effectiveness of this present Board; and I believe that we can very rightfully say that if the present administration's efforts at economy are to be taken as the standard or the criterion for the effectiveness of this Board, then certainly no Member of the House would want to support the present measure. On this basis the Board is certainly a useless agency.

I believe, instead, of calling the board set up in the pending bill a statistical board we should call it a propagating board. I think this board is to be used for two particular purposes: One, to propagate and continue some jobs that otherwise might expire, propagate, in other words, a continuity of this program of increasing and ever more increasing jobs for worthy members of the group on the Democratic side; and, second, if we do not call it a propagating board, let us call it a propaganda board. I believe they want to get statistics so that the fireside chats can be used to inform the country how many marvelous accomplishments the present administration is supposed to have brought to the people. I believe, for instance, they want to get propaganda to use in next year's election, gathering together statistics as to the marvelous accomplishments of the present administration. The taxpayers are to be called upon to pay the bill, to provide the statistics by which the present administration's program is to be put over to the country. That is the truth of this whole thing. They do not want the Democratic National Committee, because it has a deficit at the present time, to be required to gather the information for next year's election. Instead of that the taxpayers of the country are to provide the sinews of war for next year's program in the national election.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. Does this committee gather the statistics?

Mr. DITTER. As I understand it, this committee absorbs the statistics. In other words, the statistics come in from the multitudinous array of departments, commissions, bureaus, and all the other agencies the present alphabetically inclined administration has created. These statistics come in to this Board and, in turn, are disseminated by this Board to the ends of the country, to the West, to the East, to the South, and to the North, in order that the imaginary marvelous achievements of the present administration may be brought home in fireside chats and the many other radio programs embraced in the present administration's publicity program.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is it not a fact that when one of these statistical-gathering agents of any department is about ready to gather statistics they will submit it to this Board for consideration and the Board in turn may be in position to counsel and advise and to cut down the expense?

Mr. DITTER. That is true, but we also must be mindful of the fact that the chairman of this Board is appointed by the President with no confirmation by the Senate, and he has two worthy cohorts who are paid \$25 per diem to assist him. The probabilities are that rather than deleting and making it an expurgated volume, they will have the ability to add to the statistics otherwise provided to the best possible advantage of the party now in power.

Favorable statistics will be featured, others will be forgotten. Statistics excusing the experimental extravagances and the monumental mistakes will be broadcast, others will be outcasts. Statistics of the costs of the conception of the Blue Eagle, that blatant bird that was beaten recently by a bantam rooster, and the costs of the nursemaids for its nurturing, and the costs of proclaiming its potential powers, and the costs of compelling compliance to its canons, and the costs of defending its defects, and the costs of lamenting its lifelessness, and the costs of reviving its remains; ah, these statistics will be obscured by the window dressings of glittering and gaudy figures. The Statistical Board can truly be a most valuable contribution to the cause of party showmanship and salesmanship. Had the patriarchs of old been blessed with publicity agents such as the taxpayers provide for the many Federal bureaus and departments, and had they been assisted by a statistical service such as the present bill creates, they could have convinced the weary children of Israel that the wilderness was the promised land of milk and honey.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRISWOLD].

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] is now objecting to our nurturing the child of his party which was created in 1931, when the Statistical Board was established. If we divest our minds of this much ado about nothing as to the continuation of this Board, we will discover that we are not creating anything. We are continuing merely the existence of what was started and initiated in 1931. The Board now has 16 members. It has a staff of 52. This is one of the ablest personnel set-ups in the Government. I wish other agencies were as efficiently equipped with employees.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. This Board was established by Executive Order No. 6225 on July 27, 1933, and not in 1931.

Mr. GRISWOLD. To continue the functions of the Board created in 1931.

Mr. RICH. No. If the gentleman will examine the data he will find the Board was created by President Roosevelt's order No. 6225 on July 27, 1933.

Mr. GRISWOLD. They established the present Board to continue the functions of the Statistical Board which was created in 1931.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to some of the other things that the gentleman stated, and I hope the gentleman will give me his attention. The gentleman spoke about the present staff being composed of college men. I appreciate the fact that practically every member of the staff is a college man, but I am sure the gentleman does not want to leave the impression with the Members of the House that this staff, even down to the telephone operators, has not had adequate business experience prior to time of their entering into this service.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I say that the average age of the heads of the departments involved in this bill is less than 30 years of age.

Mr. GRISWOLD. The gentleman would not make it a crime to be young. May I say to the gentleman that every associate director and research director as well as statistician on this staff has had experience in private industry ranging from 3 to 5 years in addition to his college work.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman insert that information in the RECORD?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I am inserting my remarks in the RECORD. If the gentleman will give me additional time I will insert it all.

Mr. RICH. Just insert in the RECORD where these men have been employed.

Mr. GRISWOLD. The Government now has 81 agencies collecting statistics. Twenty-two of these are in three Departments: Labor, Commerce, and Agriculture. There are many duplications. This bill will coordinate them and eliminate the needless duplications.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARPENTER].

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain portions of the hearings that I shall refer to, as well as certain tables.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures that has this bill under consideration, but I believe that as such member I approached this matter under consideration in somewhat the same manner and with somewhat the same things in mind as many other Members of this Congress, because in the first place I am fundamentally opposed to an increase in boards and bureaus. In the next place I am fundamentally opposed to the operation of this Government through boards and bureaus and may I say now that I believe I am as much or more opposed to further expenditures for boards and bureaus and what they have been trying to do in running this Government than any of my friends over here on the Republican side, or any other Members of this Congress regardless of what side they may sit on.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPENTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman vote against this bill and cut out a few of these boards and bureaus?

Mr. CARPENTER. I am going to tell the gentleman now why I think the bill is important. I may say to the gentleman that I have had a speech written and prepared on my desk for 2 months setting forth my ideas. Most everybody has a plan in regard to how the Government should operate and I have my own plan, which is the decentralization of the Government, the cutting down of the expenses of the Government; and I wish to say further to the gentleman that I am absolutely as much opposed as I can be to any constitutional amendment or change in the form of our Government which will permit the taking away of the power of government from the people where it is now vested, bringing it here to Washington, and giving it to some board or bureau.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPENTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I say that the gentleman from Kansas is one of the most conscientious men in this House and he objects to things he thinks are not right.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, as I stated before, I am opposed to unnecessary boards. We all campaigned to reduce expenses and useless boards and bureaus.

Now, suppose we were going to reduce the boards and commissions, what would we have to do? We would have to appoint a committee. We would have to get a group together to see what duplications could be gotten rid of. That is just what this bill proposes to do, in my judgment, and, having these views in mind, I approached it from that angle

as a member of the committee and I listened to the arguments as to why it was or it was not a good bill.

I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the part of the hearings appearing on page 21, in which Mr. Dickinson, answering a question of Mr. CRAVENS, stated that the Board has already saved over \$12,000,000. This is pointed out here in a table that I am going to insert in the RECORD in which the committee recommended careful re-writing and drastic curtailment of the original plans in reference to this Board to the precise things intended. This table shows the savings that have been made. The Federal Housing Survey wanted \$11,137,320, and were reduced to \$1,058,120. They wanted for other services, \$4,266,800, which was reduced to about \$2,560,330.

Another item was for a census for which they wanted \$480,000, and this was reduced to \$168,032. I think this was a census, because it states, "Urban tax delinquency, census."

I quote from the committee hearings, page 40, the statement setting forth the economies that have already been brought about by this Board together with the table to which I just referred:

ECONOMIES

Federal civil-works projects.—The Board, through a special committee, reviewed some 40 statistical projects proposed by various Federal departments as undertakings to be carried on with civil-works funds. A number of these projects had been carefully worked out, and the committee was able to recommend them with minor changes to the civil-works administrator. Several projects, however, were not planned so as to obtain the information desired with a minimum expenditure of funds and burden on the business houses and individuals called on to furnish information. The Board's committee recommended careful reworking and drastic curtailments of the original plans and budgets in order to adapt these projects more closely to the precise needs they were intended to meet. The following table shows, for each of four projects, the name of the project, the sponsoring agency, the amount originally requested for its conduct, the amount finally allotted on the basis of the committee's recommendations, and the amount spent:

Projects	Sponsoring agency	Amount originally requested	Amount allotted	Amount spent
Farm housing survey.	Agriculture.....	\$11,137,320	\$1,058,120	\$1,021,398
Real property inventory.	Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Census.	4,266,800	2,560,330	2,338,000
Retail price reporting.	Bureau of Labor Statistics and interested agencies.	183,750	71,050	41,387
Urban tax delinquency.	Census.....	480,000	168,032	150,006
Total.....		16,067,870	3,857,532	3,550,791

¹ The revised plans for the survey were submitted on the basis of a 10-percent sample of the counties in the United States instead of on the basis of 100-percent coverage.

² Approximate figure.

The total estimated savings were in excess of \$12,000,000.

I also want to call the committee's attention to the hearings at page 73, when Mr. Austin, Director of the Bureau of the Census, was appearing before the committee and I asked him the following questions:

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Austin, I understood you to state that by reason of your personal contacts with business men who come to call on you and talk to you from time to time, and your correspondence with business men in general, you had come to the conclusion that the people were getting rather sick and tired of the great number of these governmental inquiries and questions that are being asked them from time to time. Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. CARPENTER. I was rather impressed with that statement, because I have come to the same conclusion by interviews with my constituents in my district, and by correspondence that I receive every day. I understood you to say there ought to be some power to stop this.

Now, I should like to ask you this question, if, in your judgment, that power is not inherently within the legislative power of Congress to stop that, and should not Congress stop that; or is that an administrative power?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think it could be stopped, a great deal of it, if the secretaries of the various departments would issue orders and enforce them. If the secretary should issue an order to a statistical service of his organization that certain schedules are not to be used and certain censuses are not to be made, or investigations or surveys, they have the authority to do that. They can do it.

Mr. CARPENTER. They have that authority now?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. CARPENTER. And you think it would be a great saving to this Government if they would do that?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; and it would stop a great nuisance to the public at large.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CARPENTER. Then my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Houston], asked the following question of Mr. Austin:

Mr. HOUSTON. I understood Mr. Carpenter to imply in one of his questions that the rank and file of the public was sick and tired of these various census takings.

Is it not a fact that one of the primary functions of this bill is to eliminate unnecessary gathering of statistics through any of the officials of your department?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is the way I take it; I do not see how you can stop it in any other way.

Then when the Secretary of Labor was before the committee, I stated that it was one of the duties of the committee to curtail expenses and asked the Secretary the following question:

Mr. CARPENTER. This particular committee is especially interested in the reduction of Government expenditures, keeping them down so far as possible.

In your judgment, Madam Secretary, would the enactment of such a bill as that pending before us tend to reduce the cost of government and the cost of the present statistical units in the various departments?

And the Secretary replied—

Secretary PERKINS. Very much, sir; because of the fact that it has already shown a method of coordinating the various activities.

For instance, in the preliminary studies of the census of unemployment, the Board has already canvassed every department as to what information it would like to have. Some of the information that the departments want cannot be gathered, but it can all be coordinated into one inquiry, and one big questionnaire can be made and one set of investigators and one set of tabulators used. You can really get, I think, a great deal more service than at present by coordinating the personnel in the various statistical units of the Government, coordinating their activities in the way here proposed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPENTER. I yield, briefly.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that all this bill does is to set up a new board whose work will be a duplication of the work of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. CARPENTER. As set forth in the hearings, the Bureau of the Budget has approved this measure and has indicated the result of it, they think, will be to cut down the expenses of the Government.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARPENTER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will refer to page 120 of the hearings, he will find that the Statistical Board in the Bureau of the Budget was absorbed and five of the executive staff of that Board transferred to the Board now in existence.

Mr. CARPENTER. I am acting in good faith in this matter. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] asked me a moment ago if I were going to vote against the bill. I am making these remarks in explanation of my position, and I think the committee is entitled to have information as to what this bill will do.

In addition I wish to call the attention of the House to the last paragraph of the report of the Committee on Expenditures in reporting this bill, which reads as follows:

The President and the Cabinet are in accord with the purposes of the proposed bill. The Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, and the Assistant and Acting Secretary of Commerce appeared before the committee and submitted constructive statements and arguments in behalf of the legislation. The bill is approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, by the Secretary of the Interior, by the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, by the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, by the Director of the Budget, and by the statisticians and economists in charge of the statistical services of the several executive departments.

The bill will provide for the continuation of economic and improved information and for the elimination of duplication, as

well as for the coordination of statistical work in the executive departments of the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there are hereby established a Central Statistical Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "committee") and a Central Statistical Board (hereinafter referred to as the "board") to plan and promote the improvement, development, and coordination of, and the elimination of duplication in, statistical services carried on by or subject to the supervision of the Federal Government, and, so far as may be practicable, of other statistical services in the United States.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOEPEL: Page 1, line 10, after the word "States", strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Including the statistics of displacement of human labor by machinery installed and in operation since 1915."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the gentleman state the grounds for his point of order, and then I should like to answer the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me this amendment is not germane. The amendment begins with the word "including", and it is not in proper form; section 1 deals with existing statistical services of the Government to plan and promote the improvement, development, and coordination of, and the elimination of duplication in, statistical services carried on by or subject to the supervision of the Federal Government. It strikes me that if the amendment were germane, it would not be germane to section 1, and therefore I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from California on the point of order.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, this bill refers to Government statistics, and I am offering an amendment referring entirely to statistics which are authorized to be taken by the Federal Labor Board if that Board would take them. This amendment simply expresses the intention of the Congress to have these same statistics gathered. Mr. Chairman, I contend the amendment is in order and I hope the Chair will so rule.

The CHAIRMAN [Mr. RANKIN]. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair thinks the amendment brings in a new matter which is not germane to the bill and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, this debate has taken a decided partisan turn. The Republicans seem to oppose it unanimously. I favor it because the memory of the Republicans cannot be trusted; therefore, unless we have a statistical department to assemble and preserve the facts, the Republicans will forget the records. For instance, it seems that they have already forgotten their own party principles and are claiming the Democratic doctrines, as evidenced by the resolutions of the "State rights grass-roots Republican convention" they have just held at Springfield, Ill.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. No, sir.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Oklahoma is out of order. He is not speaking to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moved to strike out the last word. The last words are "United States." The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Now, as to the program in this bill. The Republican grass-roots convention is of interest. They only have a lambskin—

Mr. MILLARD. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not proceeding in order. His political speech can wait until next week.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. This bill deals with statistics. I have been speaking of the Republicans in the "grass roots" convention. What has been the record of that party?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to his amendment.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. They vetoed the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to the bill. If he wants to talk about something in reference to the bill and the promises of the Republican Party, he ought to get the President of the United States to carry out some of his promises in fulfilling the Democratic platform.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma will confine himself to the amendment.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. Was it not appropriate that they should hold this "grass roots" meeting at somebody's tomb?

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I see I shall not be able to finish what I have to say and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. The Republicans have held a "grass roots" convention in the Middle West in order to get the farmers' votes in 1936. The high-tariff party courts agriculture. Wall Street goes farmer. Do not be surprised if you see a picture in the papers of J. P. Morgan dressed in overalls and milking a cow in order to find favor with the farmers. The next thing you know Ogden Mills will come out in favor of the honest dollar. The Republicans will be quoting Alexander Hamilton in defense of State rights, and Andrew Mellon will be singing, "I got hayseeds in my hair."

The once Federalist Party now champions State rights in a "grass roots" convention. I therefore favor a statistical department to keep the records, otherwise the Republicans will deny that they ever elected Hoover. Why, I cannot believe what I see. It would not be any funnier if Al Smith should start lecturing for the Anti-Saloon League. You cannot tell by what people will say what they mean any more. When five automobiles come together, they call it a "collision." If it is babies, they call it "quintuplets."

"Grass roots" State-rights Republicans, white blackbirds, and painless dentists. I shall never doubt Ripley's "believe it or not" again, for he never invented a stranger paradox than State-rights "grass roots" Republicans.

Of course, you can label a bottle anything, but the label does not change the contents. You can label a bottle of castor oil pure honey, but it does not keep you from gagging when you take the contents.

They have woven the wolf of Wall Street a lambskin coat of grass roots, but it does not conceal the predatory animal underneath. Little Red Riding Hood will discover before election day that the long sharp teeth are not her grandmother's.

The only "grass root" aid the farmers have ever had at the hands of that party has been to wear clothes of grass and root for a living.

What has been the record of the Republican Party on farm legislation?

First, there is the tariff policy. In the Senate tariff investigation, old Grundy brazenly boasted that he had written every tariff law for 25 years, and chided the farmers by saying, "You have no chips in the game", and now the Grundy tariff party holds a "grass roots" convention in the Middle West to court these same farmers who "have no chips in the game."

The "grass roots" Republican convention criticized the new deal for its cotton program of idle acres. But how does this compare with the Republican Farm Board cotton-buying program? When the Republicans started their Farm Board program, cotton was 16 cents per pound. When they finished, it was 4 cents per pound. When the Democrats started their acreage-reduction program, cotton was 4 cents.

When they finished, it was 12 cents. Now, which of these was neighbor to the man who fell among thieves?

The "grass roots" Republican convention criticized the new deal for allowing monopolies. But the record which they would like to forget shows that all the monopolies had already been formed. There was nothing left to monopolize when the new deal began. For instance, when was the Sugar Trust formed? What about the Tobacco Trust? When did the oil combines form? When were the chain stores organized? What about the steel mergers and all the long list of well-known trusts and monopolies? I do not believe I would have mentioned that word if I had been the State rights "grass roots" Republicans.

The "grass roots" Republican convention charged the new deal with putting the Government into business. The only incentive the Government has to go into business is to protect the people's rights. When monopoly exists, there is no competition to guarantee fair prices to the consumer. Therefore, the only power that can protect the people against the piracy of monopolies is the Government. Why have government in the first place, if its purpose is not to protect the rights of the individual? The survival of the fittest is the law of the jungle, but civilized man has instituted government to prevent the strong from exploiting the weak. No matter whether that strength be financial or physical, it is the duty of Government to protect the weak against the strong. We had reached the place in this country where the Government had to go into the business of protecting the weak against the strong or else go out of the business of being a government.

Then again the "grass roots" Republican convention charges the new deal with extravagance. Would the severest critic of the new deal say that people should be allowed to starve in a land of plenty? The expenditures of the new deal that are not expected to return to the Treasury are those for outright relief. If the expenditure of money that has been used to buy food and shelter for the destitute is extravagance, then we plead guilty.

If giving jobs to the unemployed in order that they might feed their children is extravagance, then we plead guilty.

If taking the youths of America from off the highway and out of the box cars and placing them in clean conservation camps with three squares a day and through them sending money to feed their mothers and sisters and brothers is extravagance, then we plead guilty.

Whose depression is this, anyway? Who is responsible for it? Who was in power for the 12 years leading up to this depression? The nerve of the Republicans in charging the Democrats with extravagance for feeding the multitudes that were thrown on relief by a Republican depression is indeed refreshing. It reminds me of the fellow who murdered his mother and father and then plead to the court for mercy on the ground that he was an orphan.

This depression began under President Harding in 1920 when the high priests of the Republican Party decided that dollars were too cheap and farm commodities were too high. They had a meeting and decided to deflate the dollar. They accordingly called in \$20,000,000,000 of credit from the grass roots. The little country banks had loaned this money on livestock and crops, and many of them were unable to meet this demand. The result was that over 7,000 "chain-harness" banks in the rural districts of the United States closed.

Thus, by a financial coup the financial masters created a dishonest dollar that robbed the farmers of their property. Wheat went from \$1.25 to 25 cents a bushel, cotton went from 20 cents to 4 cents a pound, corn went to 10 cents a bushel, eggs went to 5 cents a dozen, good horses sold for \$5 a head, and you could not get a bid on cattle.

The farmers were foreclosed because they could not pay their debts with the same dollars they borrowed. They borrowed 1 bushel of wheat and had to pay back 5, they borrowed 1 bale of cotton and had to pay back 5, they borrowed 1 cow and had to pay back 5. I ask you, Was this justice? Yet the preamble of the Constitution states that the purpose of the Constitution is "to establish justice." Where

were these Constitution savers then? And now this same party poses as the champion of agriculture.

Then, next, was the administration of Mr. Coolidge. A progressive Congress passed the McNary-Haugen bill, which was for the benefit of agriculture, but Mr. Coolidge vetoed it. He said in his veto message that it was class legislation; and now the Republicans are courting that class with a "grass roots" convention.

Then next there was the export debenture plan to help the farmers, but it likewise was cooled by Coolidge and defeated by the party that has now gone "grass roots."

Then the clouds of the depression began "Hoovering" over us. Do you remember those last hectic days under Mr. Hoover? Do you remember those last 3 months of his administration? The soup lines lengthened; Communism was knocking at our doors; there were street riots; the feet of the unemployed wore down the grass in our public parks; the gaunt wolf of starvation crouched at a million doors. One morning we picked up the paper and read where the banks of Arkansas had closed; next, the banks in California went, and Minnesota followed with her bank holiday; then Ohio closed, then Michigan, then New York. People stood around on the street corners and whispered to each other, "What is going to happen to our Government?" "Will our Constitution stand?" "Will our Government endure?" In Russia, Joseph Stalin laughed up his sleeve; in Germany, Adolph Hitler pointed to the United States as an example of the failure of democratic government.

In that critical hour there arose a clarion voice calling the people to a crusade; a crusade against selfishness, a crusade for the forgotten man, a crusade to place human rights above property rights, a crusade for a new deal—that means but one person, that spells but one name, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

And now the Republicans in their "grass roots" convention charge the new deal with destroying the Constitution. Why, if we had had 6 months more of the Republican rule, we not only would have lost our Constitution, but the whole Government of the United States. The new deal not only saved the Constitution but saved democratic government.

And may I again refer to the record. This is not the first time that the Democratic Party has saved that document; for instance, when Thomas Jefferson was elected in 1800, the Federalist Party, the then Republican Party, was as dead as a door nail. It did not even have a ticket in the field. The Democrats took care of the Constitution then without the aid of the extinct Republican Party.

Then again when Andrew Jackson was elected we see the second demise of the Republican Party and once more the Democrats were the sole and only custodians of the Constitution, but it emerged unimpaired.

The Republicans are not afraid that the Constitution will be destroyed, but they are afraid that it will be revitalized. The Republicans were only able to find that part that protected property rights. They passed over the part that would "establish justice"; they ignored the part that would "promote the general welfare."

The concentration of wealth into the hands of the few means misery for the many and is not in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution. When the new deal came into power, according to the Federal Trade Commission, 1 percent of the families owned 59 percent of the wealth and 10 percent of the families owned 90 percent of the wealth. The rich were getting richer, while the poor were getting poorer.

But the new deal has made a distinction between liberty and license, between right and privilege. It has said that one man's right to make money is tempered by another man's right to live. Will such a humanitarian program as that destroy the Constitution? On the contrary, it will breathe the breath of life into it, and make it a living document. It will make it what its framers intended it to be, a tower of strength for the weak; a haven of refuge for the distressed.

The record shows that the Constitution was safe in the hands of the Democratic Party during at least two periods

of history when there was no other party in existence, and now the twice-dead Republican Party is once more on its back gasping for life. Yes, sir; the Republican Party is under the oxygen tent and a few die-hards are trying to revive it by pumping fresh air in from the "grass roots."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the committee, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

In answer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Houston], who asked the preceding speaker if it were not appropriate to hold the "grass roots" convention at "somebody's tomb"—the tomb of the immortal Lincoln—let me say I think it was, in view of the present Democratic administration's policies, because all the liberties, the rights of the States, for which that great Southern Confederacy fought so long, shed so much blood, and expended so great a treasure, are gone, taken away by this last administration, or, if not all actually taken from us, some remain only because of the recent unanimous decisions of the Supreme Court.

The right of the States and of the political subdivisions of the States to local self-government, to the control of their own domestic affairs, would have, had the advisers of the administration succeeded in their purpose, been taken from them.

The theories advanced, the practices adopted, by the present administration and the heads of its various departments would, had they not been stopped by the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the end, have stripped from the States, counties, cities, townships, and villages, yes, from the individual himself, those privileges, those rights, those liberties, won by our forefathers through 8 long years of bitter strife.

Prefaced by words of solicitude, of sympathy for the assumed condition of a large portion of our people, of promises for the relief of those not so fortunately situated as others, the actual purpose of some of those in authority has seemed to many of us to be to create and foster unrest and class feeling, so that, in the end, when there came the natural and inevitable result of the sowing of such seeds of discontent, the planting of such thoughts of envy of the condition of others in the minds of a portion of the people, there might arise the opportunity for friends of those who had created such a condition to call for the establishment of a dictatorship.

When a great national party, granted power because of its advocacy of certain principles, of certain policies, because of the making of certain promises, deliberately and with its eyes open, with no apology for its conduct, forsakes those principles, repudiates those promises so solemnly made, it is time indeed that thoughtful, patriotic Americans gather together and once again pledge their loyalty to the purpose of maintaining freedom from oppression by bureaucrats and guaranteeing a constitutional form of government.

Yes, perhaps no better place in all the world could have been found for such a convention, for those liberty-loving men must have met in sorrow as well as in resentment as they contemplated the unauthorized, unlawful impositions put upon them by Federal and quasi-Federal officials. They must have met in a spirit of reverence, as they realized the high purpose upon which they were embarking, the purpose so similar to that which guided and sustained the man at whose tomb they were meeting. That tomb must have given them inspiration, courage, to inaugurate and to carry on the fight for honesty in government, for actual, practical, rather than theoretical, sympathy for the oppressed.

From those surroundings, realizing that there lay all that was mortal of that great character which combined so much of simplicity, so much of rugged honesty, so much of high resolve and determination to see that justice, even to the most humble, should prevail, they could not go forth other than to do battle with those who would destroy, insidiously but nevertheless effectively, what he who lay buried there had given his life to save.

If, some night, when the spirit moves you to contemplate the future of your Government, you will drift over to the far end of the Memorial Bridge, go up to the old home of the great Lee, who fought so courageously but mistakenly for the principles in which he believed, who, although found

by the gage of battle to be in error, nevertheless followed his honest convictions to the logical end, the lesson may be learned that, while he fought in opposition to the Government then in power, he fought for liberty as he conceived it to be. He fought for the right of local self-government and, while perhaps the central thought of the Confederacy was the right of freedom from Federal domination, those in control of the Democratic Party today have not only attempted to impose the Federal power upon their States, but they have endeavored, by subtle means, by indirection, to throw away the guaranties of freedom which no patriotic citizen at the end of the Civil War attempted to deny them; and, when from those hills, where lie the bodies of those thousands who have sacrificed their lives to maintain that which we here so carelessly fritter away, and from that home of the great leader of the Confederacy, you have learned the lesson of loyalty to State and to principle, as, from the tomb of Lincoln, these other men a day or so ago learned the lesson of loyalty to the Federal Government, of duty to serve, of the necessity of the preservation of our constitutional form of government, if our Nation is to survive, then look eastward toward the Capitol and you will see the Monument erected by a grateful people to the man at whose tomb these other patriots renewed their pledges of loyalty and of service. Walk across to that memorial and there, as you come around to the east and face the west, in that marble temple, you will see the statue of the statesman who gave his life so patiently—

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman must confine himself to the amendment pending before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So painstakingly, so ungrudgingly, so completely for the preservation of the Union, for the freedom of human beings.

Mr. McFARLANE. The gentleman is not confining his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Look, I beseech you, at that majestic figure which, with the light reflected down upon it, even as though it came as a benediction from heaven, looking across at the Capitol, at this House where we meet each day, expresses, through the cold marble of its substance, gentleness for our fits of anger, patience with our bickering, pity for us in our moments of egotism, sorrow for our petty ambitions and for our envy perhaps of each other and of others in places of authority, sympathy for us with our problems, understanding of our shortcomings, faith in our integrity of purpose, and, because of his faith in God, supreme confidence that in the end our Nation, through us, will continue to show the world the way to true equality, to enduring happiness. Let us, then, here, like those other men at the tomb of the great martyr, consecrate ourselves anew to the fulfillment of our oath of office, to the preservation of the Government under the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I trust the Chairman will pardon me. Coming here for the first time in January, having heard so many things from various Members of the House on so many subjects, listening, as I have, to the old, experienced Members, it has been extremely difficult sometimes to know whether a Member was talking about a bill or an amendment before the House or was making a speech for political purposes.

The purported purpose of this bill is, like all Democratic legislation which is proposed here, set forth to be for betterment. The purpose of these bills, as stated in them, is always fair on its face. Like the platform of the party in power, the purpose as stated is good. We realize that, but the trouble is that the results, the works, never follow the words, and so as to this bill we all agree with the purpose stated, but the bill is not drafted so as to accomplish that purpose. There is an amendment that I shall offer later on which may prove helpful.

I only avail myself of this occasion to speak because of the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas, to which I have

referred, and, for myself, claiming no greater degree of patriotism, no more loyalty to our Constitution, than is granted to him and to every other Member of the House. I only wish to remind you as I remind myself that, if some night you will go down to the other end of the pool and stand there in contemplation of the image of the man at whose tomb these other men gathered, you will realize, as do all of us when there, if, in the world for which we are all bound, there is recollection of the things which have gone before, of knowledge of what is here transpiring, something of the satisfaction, the gratitude, the renewal of faith which must have come to the original of that figure, when the Supreme Court read the decision in the Schechter case and gave us a new emancipation proclamation, this time coming from nine men and freeing us, all of us, not just a part of our people, from unjust burdens, restrictions, imposed arbitrarily by those without legal authority. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Michigan does not remember what is in the bill, he should have one before him.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLARD. Is it a fact that only Democrats can speak out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no. Republicans sometimes speak out of order.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. While those preceding me have discussed politics, I will not discuss politics, but will discuss common sense. First, I wish to read from a post card that I received from Modesto, Calif. Modesto is not in my district. This post card, which is dated June 4, 1935, reads as follows:

DEAR SIR: According to CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 31, 1935, you indulged in another oratorical abstraction on the evils of machinery. O. K.! Fine! But when will idealists and political progressives like you and TEVAX and MAVERICK and LUNDEEN and MARCANTONIO learn the utter futility of parliamentary legislation to effect reform of these galling social abuses? You sit in Washington, nearly 600 of you, at \$10,000 per, and build up neat houses of legislative cards of reform.

I dare not read the rest of it, because my Republican friends would applaud. [Laughter.]

The Committee has opposed my proposal to amend this bill to provide for the obtaining of statistics on the displacement of human labor by the machine. The President of the United States has shown an inclination to survey this proposal which I have advanced, to ascertain how labor-saving machinery is contributing to our unemployment situation.

If we are going to have statistics, let us have statistics which will be worth while and which the Members of Congress will not throw into the wastebasket. I quote from a letter received from the National Emergency Council. It states:

At the direction of the President of the United States, I am acknowledging your letter and enclosure under date of May 16, which has been referred to this office for attention. You are interested in investigating the effect of the introduction of machines on unemployment, and suggest that a tax be placed upon such machines which displace labor.

The Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, have filed application with the National Emergency Council for an allotment of \$9,370,000 for a census of business. Since you suggest that it may be possible to incorporate your suggestion in the proposed census, this office has transmitted the file you submitted to the Bureau of the Census for their consideration.

Your interest in advancing this suggestion is much appreciated, and I trust that you will not hesitate to call upon this office for information regarding the works-relief program.

Sincerely yours,

T. P. CARROLL,

Special Assistant to the Executive Director.

I cannot understand why, if we are going to appropriate thousands upon thousands of dollars for statistical purposes, we cannot and should not permit to be incorporated in this bill a provision whereby those same people will be in a position to investigate why millions of men have been thrown out of employment and continue unemployed. It is my opinion that such distressing unemployment conditions as confront us today may be attributed, in large part, to the machines which have taken the jobs of millions of our peo-

ple and forced them into unemployment. Undeniably, the machine is an important contributing factor to unemployment.

The laboring men of the United States are becoming increasingly conscious of the havoc created in their ranks through the introduction of labor-saving machinery. The American Technotax Society, founded in Whittier, Calif., last year, advocates a national survey to ascertain the statistics on labor displacement by the machine, with a view to taxing the machines which most violently displace labor.

Other organizations espousing the idea of the American Technotax Society are being formed in various parts of the United States, thus attesting to the fact that those who are the real sufferers in machine displacement of human labor are more alert to the menace of the situation for all our people than is the Congress, which is charged with the responsibility of legislating in the people's interest but which has, as yet, failed to consider this basic question of labor displacement by the machine.

Statistics of the Labor Bureau show that between 1923 and 1928, years of unusual prosperity, the number of factory workers in the United States actually decreased by one and a quarter millions. The United States Census of 1930 shows that today there are 330,000 fewer factory workers than in 1914, despite a population increase of 20,000,000 and an increase in factory production of 72.4 percent.

The technotax will control this monster, the machine, which is rapidly depriving laborers of work and concentrating wealth in the hands of a few, for the profits of the machine are rarely distributed to the consumers by lowering the price of products. Rather, they go to the greedy capitalistic machine owners. Machines have disrupted our society and destroyed the purchasing power of the masses. Machines of steel cannot consume the food or purchase the clothing, automobiles, and other articles which employed workers would have consumed. Naturally business cannot be revived by trying to squeeze blood from a turnip. The technotax offers a solution to the problem.

Contrary to popular belief on the part of the skeptical, the technotax will not hinder progress; it is a genuine progressive measure. For every labor-displacing invention there are at least 10 inventions not displacing labor which would not be hampered by taxation—that is, inventions which tend toward quality production rather than quantity production. Other inventions originating new industries, such as the radio and airplane of the past, also would escape taxation. The technotax would only be applied to those few inventions dealing with mass-production machinery—that is, labor-displacing inventions.

The tax would be so adjusted that it would be inexpedient to substitute hand labor for the machine in use, but it perhaps would discourage the installation of huge mass-production machinery in the future unless the demand for the products of the machine was excessive. In other words, the technotax would not lead us back toward the Stone Age.

The technotax would enable the little producer, with little or no mass-production machinery, to compete with the large machine-equipped factories of the great industrialists, and, moreover, the funds derived from the tax would guarantee every worker a job.

The hand arts would receive a stimulus through the technotax. Products of the arts and crafts of man would displace in part the cheap, artificial articles of the machine.

The technotax would not discourage scientific research and invention except in the line of inventions providing for labor-displacing machinery. Our scientists would still continue to devise means to insure safety of human life, lessen human suffering, improve the quality of products, effect economies in the utilization of byproducts, and do many other worthy works.

The technotax is an excellent conservation measure for the future. At the present accelerated rate of improvement of mass-production machinery, we soon will be able to produce so rapidly that our natural resources, the ultimate source of supply, will rapidly approach complete ex-

haustion, as they are by no means infinite. We must think of the future. Already much of our oil, coal, and other mineral resources are depleted in many fields.

With these exhausted, our only sources of power will be water, solar, and tidal power, and power derived from vegetable extractions, which latter, if used to any great extent, would rapidly exhaust the fertility of the soil. We must put four-wheel brakes on the rapid utilization of resources by slowing down mass production with the technotax.

The technotax is the most satisfactory type of sales tax yet suggested. It will be easy to enact, enforce, and collect. It can be practically free from political graft if properly managed by a nonpartisan board of economists, laborers, and producers. It will enable the hand worker to compete with the iron robot, the machine, without discouraging the maintenance of machinery; in short, it would gear technological progress into time with human needs. Though it will raise commodity prices, it will also eliminate unemployment and establish a more uniform purchasing power. It will not thwart private initiative; it will not tax incomes and earnings, and yet it will redistribute wealth on an absolutely fair basis.

Summarizing, I wish to call your attention to the fact that the technotax is not a hair-brained dream of an idealist—it has been suggested independently by organizations and qualified individuals. It will effectively cure our unemployment situation by enabling the hand laborers to compete with their enemy, the machine, and thus will serve as a measure of wealth redistribution. It is a real progressive measure, for though it apparently deters progress in the installation of mass-production machinery, it will not hamper the many real progressive inventions such as those designed to improve the quality of goods, inaugurate new industries, and provide for the entertainment, protection, and comfort of our citizens. It will put four-wheel brakes upon mass production and ward off that rapidly approaching day when Americans, like the Chinese of today, will desperately seek for a crumb of bread and a lump of coal or a stick of wood.

The technotax will be easy to enact and enforce, and will serve to redistribute wealth on a just basis without taxing earnings or income, and without thwarting private initiative in the least. It will have to come soon—why not now?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOEPEL] has expired.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. EKWALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. Speaking on the question of statistics, I was rather amused at the statements of my genial Democratic friend from Oklahoma, JOSH LEE. I was wondering why the gentleman did not put in some of the statistics as to the recent city election in Wilmington, Del., which he went up there to help carry for the Democratic mayor. [Laughter and applause.] They would have been statistics that would have been of interest here. The gentleman went up to Wilmington, Del., I understand, at the behest of the Democratic organization to, in his own inimitable style, exhort the faithful to return this Democratic mayor to office, and he managed to help change a previous Democratic majority into a Republican majority of over 6,500 for the Republican mayoralty candidate. Those are the statistics that we like on this side, and we are going to have more of them.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. EKWALL. The gentleman does not like those statistics.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is not talking to the amendment now before the committee. If the gentleman in charge of the time on the Republican side had granted the gentleman from Oklahoma

[Mr. LEE] an opportunity to speak out of order and discuss certain matters I would not raise the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon will proceed in order.

Mr. EKWALL. I submit I am speaking on statistics, so I will proceed in the same manner. I take it that the gentlemen on the Democratic side do not like these statistics.

Mr. McFARLANE. I take it that if it can be arranged for JOSH LEE to answer you, he will amply take care of your case all right.

Mr. EKWALL. I did not ask him to leave.

Mr. McFARLANE. I know, and the gentleman knows, he was not permitted to make his speech uninterrupted. The gentleman is not in order, Mr. Chairman, and he knows it.

Mr. EKWALL. But these are statistics that we should like to have you put in the RECORD, because this is like manna from Heaven. But if you go up into our Republican districts, as I understand was done by the gentleman from Oklahoma, and make them more Republican than ever, I should be very glad to have the gentleman from Oklahoma, JOSH LEE, come back and explain how he does this, as we may want to send him out to some other districts, on similar missions, from time to time.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. EKWALL. No, no; I am sorry. I only have a few moments left. But I predict we are going to have more statistics of that kind and we are going to inform you as to such statistics from time to time hereafter and whether you like them or not, you are going to have to put up with them. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. EKWALL] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The committee shall consist of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor.

SEC. 3. The board shall consist of a chairman, who shall be appointed by the President, and not to exceed 13 additional members, who shall be selected in such manner as the President shall prescribe: *Provided*, That not less than 10 of such members shall be persons already in the service of the United States. The chairman and all the members shall be persons technically trained in statistics, economics, or public administration, known in their profession as of high standing and wide experience. The chairman shall be the chief executive officer of the board, shall receive a salary of \$10,000 a year, and shall not engage in any private business, vocation, or employment: *Provided, however*, That if the chairman shall at the same time hold any other paid position in the service of the United States, he shall receive during such tenure no additional remuneration for acting as chairman of the board. No other member of the board shall receive compensation for his services as such member, except that the board may provide that any such other member not at the same time holding any other paid position in the service of the United States shall, while attending or traveling to or from meetings of the board or of committees thereof, receive a salary of not more than \$25 per diem, and in addition thereto necessary traveling and subsistence expenses.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 2, line 14, after the word "of," strike out "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I simply offer the amendment in the interest of economy.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we covered that matter of the salary in the analysis of the bill. This is an important measure, recommended to us by those who have studied and participated in the activities of this board for the past year and a half. As I said, in undertaking to analyze this paragraph of the act, the chairman of this board will be called upon to deal with the executive heads of the Government, and if this board is to function, he should be a man of outstanding competence. If he is the character of man such as we authorize the appointment of, he will be worth \$10,000 a year and it will be economy to have that kind of a man.

I oppose the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The board shall have authority to appoint such employees as it deems necessary for its own functions. All such employees shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the board may, with the consent of the Civil Service Commission, appoint and fix the compensation of any person or persons for temporary periods without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That no person shall hold such temporary appointment or appointments for an aggregate period of more than 12 months. The board may make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of Government and elsewhere; for law books and books of reference; and for paper, printing, and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and as may be provided for by the Congress from time to time. The board may purchase supplies or services where the aggregate amount involved is not more than \$50, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (36 Stat. 861; U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5). There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, annually such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of the board; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for all expenditures of the Board, including personal services; rent at the seat of Government and elsewhere; traveling and subsistence expenses; car fare; salaries and expenses of members; contract stenographic reporting services; telephone and telegraph services; cablegrams and radiograms; postage; printing; binding; multigraphing and mimeographing; stationery; furniture and office equipment; purchase and exchange of typewriters and labor-saving devices; professional, scientific, law, and reference works; subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals; press clippings; and supplies, \$200,000, of which amount not to exceed \$190,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 24, insert the words "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 1, after the word "board", strike out all down to and including the figure "\$200,000" in line 13, and insert "not to exceed \$180,000".

Page 4, line 14, strike out "\$190,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$170,000".

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make one or two comments because I believe that on the Republican side of the House there may be some opposition that I feel to be unwarranted. We may well assume that the N. R. A. extension will come to us before long; and if that agency be extended, there can be no doubt but what this matter will also be carried on by that organization at least during the time of its extension.

Here we are given an opportunity to legislate for ourselves rather than by Executive order. We have had an opportunity to discuss this bill on its merits today, and I much prefer that it be passed by our own act rather than by another Executive order.

They have been very fortunate indeed to have the Assistant Secretary of Commerce act in the capacity of chairman of this board and have saved this \$10,000. Of course we do not know who the man may be who will receive this \$10,000 a year. Like the gentleman from Mississippi we, too, hope he will be big enough, broad enough, and able enough to deal with executive departments of the Government. There is no provision in the bill as to how the other Members are to be appointed, except as the President may dictate. The chairman of the board might well have some power of selection.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], in charge of the bill for the minority, said he wished the bill had teeth in it. That is where he and I differ a little. If you put teeth into this bill and this board begins to order other departments about and demand that they "discontinue this or discontinue that", then indeed, will you have established another permanent bureau, for they might take over functions and duties of such departments permanently, whereas they cannot do this if we do not put teeth in the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I would assume that if this committee to be appointed had the power to do something it would really function in accordance with the best ideas of sound business and would eliminate from the departments a dual gathering of statistics. This would save the taxpayers of the country much money and the Congress much worry trying to find ways and means to foot the bills this administration is incurring through these enormous expenditures of Government funds, creating a great national debt. Where will you ever get the money to pay our debts now being created?

Mr. GIFFORD. I admit that the President of the United States will have power over whomsoever he may appoint, and that plenty of Executive authority may be exercised.

For the reasons I have outlined, I am willing to support this bill establishing this central statistical authority; and I hope this will not be regarded as a party measure. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Section 5, Page 5, line 9, insert: "Provided, That this subsection shall not be construed to require or to make lawful any disclosures of confidential information if such disclosure is specifically prohibited by law."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. The board shall—

(a) At the request of the President or the committee, or may of its own motion, investigate and make recommendations with respect to any existing or proposed statistical work carried on by an agency of, or subject to the supervision of, the Federal Government;

(b) Have the power, with the consent of the agency concerned, to investigate and make recommendations with respect to any existing or proposed statistical work carried on by any agency in the United States other than the agencies specified in subsection (a) of this section;

(c) Have the power, subject to such rules and regulations as the President or the committee may prescribe, to require from any agency specified in subsection (a) of this section information, papers, reports, and original records concerning any existing or proposed statistical work carried on by or subject to the supervision of any such agency;

(d) Plan and promote the economical operation of agencies engaged in statistical work and the elimination of unnecessary work both on the part of such agencies and on the part of persons called on by such agencies to furnish information;

(e) Perform such other duties consistent with section 1 of this act as the President or the committee may authorize, and make such reports to the committee as the committee may require; and

(f) Make an annual report to the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN offers the following amendment: At the end of section 5 add a new section to be known as "section 5 (a)", as follows:

"Sec. 5. (a) The committee shall, prior to the convening of the next session of Congress, file with the Clerk of the House a report showing in detail (a) the savings which have been made by it under the powers herein conferred; (b) wherein the elimination of duplication in statistical services carried on by, or subject to the supervision of, the Federal Government or other statistical services in the United States has been accomplished by the committee or board; and pointing out wherein other savings may be made and in what manner statistical services referred to in this bill may be improved, developed, and coordinated."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane.

I call my colleague's attention to the fact that we already have in the bill a paragraph numbered 5 (a).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that this merely requires the making of a report to Congress and is germane to the bill at this point. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, very often we talk politics. Sometimes perhaps we should not. There is always politics in the bills offered by the majority when viewed from the standpoint of the minority. It does not make very much difference which party happens to be in the majority.

This bill states a good purpose. There is no question about that. Whether you believe it or not, some of us on the other side would like to be engaged in a little constructive legislation. The first paragraph of the bill states that it is to plan and promote the improvement, development, and coordination of, and the elimination of duplication in statistical services. Everyone is in favor of that. The gentleman who spoke awhile ago [Mr. CARPENTER], a member of the committee on the majority side, said he was in favor of getting rid of duplication. As individuals we always are in favor of that, though sometimes as Members on one side or the other, or of one party or the other, we feel constrained to vote in some other way.

The amendment which I have proposed, in my judgment, will help to carry out the stated purpose of the bill. While that is stated to be "to eliminate", nowhere in it can I find any words which authorize or require either the committee or the board to eliminate anything, to dispense with anything, or to make a saving either in money or in service.

Mr. Chairman, let us for a moment assume that the bill was drawn only for the purposes stated, not to create new jobs, and sought to accomplish something, namely, to get rid of some duplication of service. There is nothing in the bill which actually does that. The bill, however, does provide that the committee through the board created may make recommendations, and so this amendment is offered for the purpose of helping the situation. The amendment, as will be noted, states that the committee shall, prior to the convening of the next session of Congress, file with the Clerk of the House a report showing in detail (a) the savings which have been made by it under the powers herein conferred. When we come back here in January we should have a report showing what has been accomplished. That is only fair. Then the amendment further states that this board should show in detail wherein the "elimination of duplication in statistical services carried on by or subject to the supervision of the Federal Government" has been accomplished by the committee or board, and also pointing out wherein other savings may be made and in what manner statistical services referred to in the bill may be "improved, developed, and coordinated." If we have this information at the next session of the Congress, we can really accomplish something. Some of you gentlemen have been here for years and no doubt know all about this. Some of us have come down here and are new to the situation. It is impossible for us, even from those gentlemen who come before the committee, to learn how these things can be done. If the amendment be adopted then we get something of value for the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. We will learn whether the announced purpose of the bill, the reasons advanced for its passage, have been in part or in whole accomplished, and what more, if anything along this line, we can do to prevent waste to cut down expense to prevent duplication.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the motive of the gentleman who is a member of the committee, and I am not undertaking to disclose any of the proceedings of the committee hearings, but I want to say in all fairness to the other members of the committee that if the gentleman had thought there was merit in his amendment he should have first submitted it to the committee of which he is a member.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I trust the gentleman will bear with me. I supposed, of course, that the House would be the proper place to offer the amendment. I was in hopes that the gentleman would accept the amendment, both of us having the same thing in mind, and the amendment, I may say, is offered in good faith.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I stated that I appreciated the motive of my friend, the gentleman from

Michigan, and I think we could have been of some service to him if he had presented his amendment to the committee.

This is not merely an amendment that will provide that a report be submitted to the Congress. That would not be objectionable. I trust reports will be submitted to Congress. I take it that the report submitted by this board will be available to the Members of Congress, and that every Member of Congress may obtain the report. Ordinarily an executive agency or an executive department transmits their report through the President of the United States, while I appreciate the motive of the gentleman from Michigan, if it is desired to amend this bill, we should amend it by doing the usual thing, and that is require that the President of the United States submit the report to the Congress. The amendment goes further, Mr. Chairman, and my objection goes to the merits of the proposition. The gentleman states that there is nothing in this bill which requires or provides for the elimination of duplication.

By reference to section 1, the bill specifically requires that the board will plan and promote the improvement, development, and coordination of and the elimination of duplication in statistical services. By reference to paragraph 5, defining the powers of the board, the board is required to investigate and make recommendations with respect to existing or proposed statistical work.

With all deference and with the very kindest of feelings to the gentleman from Michigan, if a report is to be submitted to the Congress of the United States we are entitled to the whole report, not merely that which deals with the elimination of duplication and with economies, but the real substantive work of the board, to wit, its investigations and its recommendations with respect to existing or proposed statistical work. We should have all of the work of this board, not only with respect to the elimination of the duplication on economies, but the larger and more important work relating to the coordination of all of the statistical work in the various departments of the Government. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say that the amendment could be improved upon and certainly before this body adopts the amendment the substance of it should be improved upon.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Michigan when he offers an amendment that a report should be made to the Members of Congress certainly ought to be taken in good faith by this committee. It is asked only that the board make an annual report to the Congress. There is no reason under the heavens why the board should not submit a report to the Members of Congress showing exactly what they are doing. The amendment as offered by the gentleman from Michigan will certainly require that information to be furnished to Congress and we as Members of Congress ought to have it in order to know what they are actually doing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I did not speak with clearness, if the gentleman did not catch my point. I prefaced my remarks by saying that if this amendment required specifically that the report be submitted to the Congress I would have no objection to it. The trouble is that the amendment is ill advised, and not well drawn. It merely requires the board to submit a part of the work to the Members of the Congress.

My point is that if the report of the committee is to be submitted to the Congress of the United States, the entire report should be submitted and not simply a part of it. It would be just as futile, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as to say that the President of the United States shall report to Congress that he has faithfully executed the laws of the land when, under the Constitution, he is required to execute the laws. The very requirement

that a report is to be submitted presupposes that the report will cover not only the matters mentioned in the amendment, but the larger and more important matters covered by the powers vested in the board.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I am not mistaken, and I think I am not, the amendment contains the language of the first section and uses the words "to plan and promote the improvement, development, and coordination"—

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I catch the gentleman's point and the amendment does that, but the gentleman omits the most important part of the bill, which relates to the powers under the bill. The powers are stipulated in section 5 and the gentleman's amendment makes no provision whatever with respect to the report covering all the matters that the board is really authorized to do.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARPENTER. If there is going to be any amendment adopted along the lines that my colleague has just suggested, I would suggest that the amendment be made on page 5, line 22, section (f), with respect to making annual reports to the committee. We could then add "to the Congress of the United States."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That amendment was not pending, was not considered in the committee, and I take it was not thought to be important.

I oppose the amendment for the reasons stated and call for the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

Mr. Chairman, I beg the pardon of the Committee for taking the floor a second time to discuss this bill, and I wish to reiterate that I shall not bring politics into the question, but I shall discuss a matter of "grass root" importance. We have heard quite a bit recently from the Republicans about "grass roots", and I feel that in this bill we are not getting down to the "grass roots" with respect to the statistics that are required.

We are taking statistics of almost every imaginable sort, but with all our zeal to possess compiled information in reference to the numbers of our unemployed, our unemployables, and so forth, we have overlooked the actual "grass roots" of the problem and have shown a surprising indifference to the agency which is actually creating unemployment. I refer to mass-production machinery.

I have here in my hand a letter sent out by the National Organization for Taxation of Labor Displacing Devices, with headquarters at East Liverpool, Ohio, signed by L. A. Finlay, president of this national organization, stating that his organization was formed less than a year ago, and that—

We hope to reach the 100,000 member mark within the next 3 months. * * * We have secured the endorsements of officials of five national unions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the question at issue is that of the displacement of human labor by the modern machine. If we examine the coal industry, we will find that over 100,000 men have lost their jobs in the last 10 years as a result of the introduction of the machine. The coal-mine owner also owns the machine, and, therefore, he enjoys a monopoly. The price of coal has not decreased, and the purchasing power of thousands of men, who have been taken out of employment and forced on relief, has been destroyed. What have we done to eliminate this unemployment situation? From a common-sense, "grass roots" standpoint, absolutely nothing! We are increasing the burdens of taxation to the people by the continued issuance of tax-exempt bonds to secure funds to send these unemployed coal miners, en masse

with their families, to other communities where we have built subsistence homesteads, which have yielded no substantial return on the investment.

I feel we ought to get to the "grass-roots" of this problem, and if we want statistics, let us have statistics that are worth while. We are providing for statistics in this bill, but the Committee has refused to approve an amendment which would authorize a survey of the displacement of human labor by the machine. As we appear to accomplish nothing in the Congress except on the suggestion of the President, I hope the President will ultimately approve of my proposal.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEPEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman expect that this Bureau will submit the kind of statistics to the Congress that he has mentioned?

Mr. HOEPEL. I believe we have some honest, conscientious men in that infernal "brain trust", and I think we would get a report which would be helpful to us.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Is there any agency now that is assembling statistics of the kind the gentleman has mentioned?

Mr. HOEPEL. I may tell the gentleman that the Library of Congress assembled some startling information for Senator DAVIS, of Pennsylvania, and I obtained a copy of that report. This report shows that one machine in the steel industry displaces 175 men, and in the glass-blowing industry one machine displaces from 30 to 50 or more men, and yet, in the face of such conditions, we devote our energies to acquiring statistics that will be of no practical value, when we ought to be seeking statistical information that will give us a key to the situation and provide a sound basis for imposing a tax on the labor-displacing machine and on the profiteer who controls the patent and the general rights on the machine.

The Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, recognizes the bedrock principle of the technotax. In a communication of recent date, addressed to me by the Director of the Census Bureau, he states that in his opinion the project for a survey of machine displacement of human labor with view to the imposition of the technotax should be set up upon a separate and independent basis, preferably by action of Congress.

Every individual of common intelligence knows that our trouble in America today lies in the fact that, because of the machine, too much is produced by the few with the result that those who are displaced by the machine are themselves left without purchasing power. The erroneous new deal philosophy which seeks to reduce production to the requirement of the few who labor must inevitably fail as it makes no provision for earned income to the workers who are displaced.

The machine needs but few operatives and the machine, in order to be maintained, must have millions of consumers. The technotax would permit more people to produce and would thus provide more consumers. The iron man is not a consumer of food, or the purchaser of other commodities. Its consumption is limited to oil, a bit of latent power in coal or water power, and such products as are required, in limited amounts from time to time, to keep it in condition for its productive use.

Machine despoliation is an economic tidal wave which has engulfed the American workers. It is a tidal wave of such magnitude that for Congress to go home without enacting basic recovery legislation, as is the technotax, is like an army going out to beat off an enemy but pausing only long enough to appropriate billions of the taxpayers' money for maintaining an army in combat and for relief to the sufferers before retreating without any intelligent, coordinated effort to defeat the enemy.

Even more important still is the duty of Congress to coin money and regulate the value thereof and to take from the private financier the subsidy and monopoly which he enjoys in issuing governmental credit on the mere force of a fountain-pen signature. The American Nation has submitted too long to the rape of the machine and to usury. Both of these agencies add to the wealth of the machine owner, the patentee, and the private banker, while the exact

proportion that the machine monopolizes industry and usury prevails the common people suffer economic slavery and, in many instances, even worse than the slavery which existed prior to Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation.

The technotax is a sensible method of solving our unemployment problem without wrecking the capitalistic system.

Under leave to insert in the RECORD, I submit herewith Economic Heirlooms, issued by the American Technotax Society, of Whittier, Calif. This society is composed of a group of educators who, from an unselfish standpoint, are contributing, in addition to their studies, as much as their limited funds will permit, to the education of the public on the vital question of unemployment, its underlying causes, and the means which they propose to correct the situation; that is, the technotax.

ECONOMIC HEIRLOOMS—SELECTED EXAMPLES OF THE QUAINT HALF-TRUTHS AND MISCONCEPTIONS OF THE MACHINE AGE THAT ARE CURRENT AMONG ECONOMISTS, NEWSPAPERMEN, LEGISLATORS, BUSINESS MEN, AND OTHERS

"American industry stands at the parting of the ways. If we continue to repeat to ourselves the formulas of an outworn economic system and fail to adjust the overpowering forces of technology to the needs of humanity, then capitalistic society is doomed to the historic scrap heap." (Samuel Bristol, executive secretary, American Technotax Society.)

Prosperity is just around the corner: This naive theory has been circulating at intervals since the collapse of December 1929. Its authors have made the wish father to the thought. "Leave business alone and all will be O. K." They overlook the significant fact that mounting unemployment was a feature of the business boom of 1921-29. The curve of production went up, while the curve of employment dropped. Yet the theory lingers on.

Prosperity demands increased world trade: One of the many devices by which the economists of big business would restore business and relieve unemployment. They forget that world trade is done with bills of exchange. For each dollar's worth of exports we receive a dollar's worth in imports. But the imported dollar's worth contains two to five times as much labor as the exported one, and American laborers get the worst of the deal. Anything beyond a minimum volume of world trade is a threat to the job of every factory worker and brings him nearer to the wage and living standards of the coolie. America's best market is her employed wage earners.

This glorious machine age: The economists of big business with their journalistic hirelings have made a fetish of machine progress. In the name of progress they develop more labor savers, cut down pay rolls, and try to squeeze dividends out of a surfeited market. This gigantic conspiracy against American labor has brought our unemployed total to 11,000,000. Yet one still finds men with run-down heels and a high polish on the seat of their best trousers, repeating with gravity and assurance the philosophy of machine efficiency.

Industrial codes: A well-meaning but ill-advised attempt to force American industrialists to reemploy the workers whom their efficiency experts had eliminated with labor-saving machines. The codes were based upon the unwarranted assumption that the proper way to get men back into industry is to raise wages and shorten hours. The result was new varieties of chiseling, together with increased development of labor-saving machinery and speeding.

America's high living standards: One of the most popular fallacies. Statistics reveal that a large part of the labor force subsists on much less than the income required to maintain a minimum American standard of living.

Leisure of the machine age: The production per unit of American workers has increased more than 100 percent in the past 30 years. Yet there are millions still working long hours at starvation wages, while other millions are unemployable. Is it leisure or unemployment?

Machines do not destroy jobs but make more work: One example will show the absurdity of this claim. A steam shovel can be built with 1,000 man-hours or less of labor. It will replace 25 to 50 men and in 5 years a total of 250,000 man-hours. The ratio of labor investment to returns is 1 to 250—not bad guessing for curbstone economists.

Discharged factory workers find other industrial jobs: Another fallacy. One group of 750 industrial workers displaced by machines was investigated by the Labor Bureau. Only 55 percent had found steady work in 6 months. Other researches show the same trend.

Progress in the machine age: A race of dwarfed, tuberculous Lancaster mill workers gives an adequate picture of machine progress in England. America, with half the gold of the world and great mechanical advance, leads the world in crimes, divorces, and suicides. We have no competitors in the stupid inadequacy of our economic distribution. We are breeding a race of cowed, neurotic job hunters.

The philosophy of abundance: Dreamers picture a world in which power and machines would create abundance for all with a working day of 2 or 3 hours. What are the facts? Our fuel and mineral resources are being squandered at an unheard-of rate. Natural gas is nearly gone; the last reserves of petroleum are being tapped; anthracite coal is scarce and expensive. Our last great lumber area is rapidly being exhausted, and our consumption of lumber is three times the replacement. Electricity we

have—but because of profligate deforestation, dwindling streams supply less than 30 percent of electrical energy, the other 70 percent being obtained from a lessening fuel supply. With the passing of Theodore Roosevelt, conservation has been forgotten. Coming generations can look out for themselves.

The self-sufficiency of capitalism: American industry, the pride of our age, is rapidly going the way predicted by Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto. Since 1920 labor displacement by machines has been an uncontrollable factor. Efficiency is eliminating the mass of the workers, but it has destroyed their buying power at the same time. Capitalism is proving to be a self-destructive enterprise.

What is the answer? Though conditions are admittedly bad, the Technotax Society believes there is a way out of our economic difficulties. We urge you to lay aside prejudice or bias while you study this plan.

Technotax proposes graduated taxes on the products of labor-saving machinery, graduated by units corresponding in number to the workers displaced by each machine. Thus a 10-man machine would pay 10 units of unemployment-relief funds.

Technotax is essentially a revenue measure. From our total of more than \$40,000,000,000 worth of manufactures it would raise funds sufficient to take care of the entire public-works program, and extend that program to the point where private industry could take up the unemployment slack.

Technotax will solve our financial woes and create circulation of money by giving buying power to the greatest consumer in the world—the American workingman. It would lift the burden of unemployment relief off the shoulders of general property taxpayers and save the Federal Government from financial collapse. It would enable us to balance the Budget by the simple expedient of paying as we go.

Technotax would gear technological development into time with the needs of the people. It would put free-wheeling and four-wheel brakes on the crazy industrial juggernaut that is threatening ruin to the Nation.

Technotax proposes a nonpartisan commission of the ablest business men and economists to set rates that will reduce unemployment and stabilize business. It does not seek to destroy machinery, but only to make secure for mankind the wonderful contribution which machine production is capable of giving us. It is the alternative to technocracy or communism.

Technotax has been endorsed by Congressmen, leading economists and business leaders as a workable recovery measure. It is in accord with the principles of the new deal. It is based upon proven economic experience.

Mr. HOEPEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a circular entitled "Economic Heirlooms", issued by the American Technotax Society on the displacement of human labor by the machine.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman has asked to insert a circular. How many pages of the Record will it take?

Mr. HOEPEL. Oh, it will not take more than one side of a page, approximately.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman what he proposes to do with these statistics when he obtains them. To my mind they are like Supreme Court decisions, you cannot eat them and you cannot wear them and you cannot sleep in them.

Mr. HOEPEL. I would answer the gentleman by saying that I propose that these statistics be submitted to the Congress of the United States as a basis for remedial legislation. They should not be sent to the capitalistic economists who adorn most of the departments here in the new deal. They would sterilize any suggestions not in accord with their synthetic views.

Mr. TRUAX. Of what account will they be after you obtain them? Everybody knows that machines are displacing labor.

Mr. HOEPEL. It will furnish us with information upon which we can enact legislation. This question of machine displacement of human labor is so vast and so important that we must have an intelligent and comprehensive survey and analysis in order to proceed in the best interest of all.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. EKWALL asked for and was given leave to revise and extend his remarks.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The Central Statistical Board created by Executive Order No. 6225, dated July 27, 1933, as amended by Executive Order No. 6700, dated May 4, 1934 (hereinafter referred to as the "old

Board"), shall cease to exist at such time as the committee shall declare that seven members have qualified for membership in the Board; and thereafter all records, papers, property, and funds of the old Board shall become records, papers, property, and funds of the Board; and such employees of the old Board as shall be designated by the committee and shall pass noncompetitive tests of fitness prescribed by the Civil Service Commission shall acquire classified civil-service status, and shall be employees of the Board at the grades and salaries specified in their respective examinations: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed to impair any obligation incurred by the old Board.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 5, line 25, strike out the words "by Executive Order No. 6700, dated May 4, 1934 (hereinafter referred to as 'the old Board').".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Page 6, line 6, strike out "of the old Board as shall be designated by the committee and" and insert the word "as."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Page 6, line 8, strike out the word "noncompetitive" and insert the word "competitive."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to this fact. It has been stated that this is a continuation of a Board established in 1931. I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that this Board—the Central Statistical Board—was established by Executive Order No. 6225, July 7, 1933. Powers and duties redefined by Executive Order No. 6700, May 4, 1934. It was established by two Executive orders by the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, under the N. I. R. A. It is not a continuation of the Board established by any other administration. It is a new Board set-up to be used by the present administration ruled over by the President, Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I invite the gentleman's attention to page 128 of the hearings. It not only states that the Federal Statistics Board is now in existence, but it was absorbed by the Statistical Board of 1933, having been created by the Budget itself, and five members were transferred without competitive examinations, which the pending bill does not permit. The proposed Board is to undergo a competitive test. When the Board was established in 1931 and absorbed by this Board established in 1933, there were transferred without a competitive test five members of the Board.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman refers to what was heard in the committee. I want to say that we cannot take everything for granted that is stated before the committee. Frequently what is said before the committee is all poppycock, and there is no real regard, you may say, for some of those statements. You frequently quote the hearings as something based on facts, whereas in many cases there is no basis for fact. It is only some fellow's idea, and you all know what that is. Many times it is simply "bunk." Not facts.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I was directing the gentleman's attention, not to the hearings, but what is contained in the annual report of this Board. I am making this statement of facts given me by the members of this particular Board themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. The Board, with the approval of the committee, is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provisions to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This bill provides \$180,000 a year to do what has been done for the last 2 years, according to data on page 45 of the hearings of the committee, for \$35,000 a year. It also continues another board to go along and duplicate the functions of the Bureau of the Budget. If we are going to cut down expenses, we have to force the Bureau of the Budget to follow this thing up and stop duplication of statistics. This Board will make it worse.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. A recent tabulation has been made which shows that the United States Government is paying salaries of \$10,000 a year to 989 different people. The number on the pay roll who get from \$5,000 to \$10,000 per year is 7,223. Approximately 100,000 new positions have been created by the new deal for "new dealers", which are exempt from the civil service law. This is simply to add further to the list of \$10,000 positions.

Mr. TABER. It does; and we ought to beat this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition. When I was making an analysis of the bill I referred the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in answer to his question as to the work of the Board, to page 45 of the hearings. I should have referred him to pages 121 to 128. Subsequently, I specifically called his attention to the fact that the expenditures on page 45, aggregating \$70,000, so far as expenditures up to date of April 1 are concerned, were but a part of the expenditures of the Board, and I specifically called his attention further to the fact that other expenditures of the Board were to be found on page 170. Not only that, but I stated that this committee was just as diligent as he was to ascertain just what the cost of the Board was during the past year; and, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Massachusetts, the committee required the Board to furnish us with a letter or memorandum giving us the expenses, and I specifically stated that was given in a letter dated May 9, 1935, and those figures show that the amount spent directly by this Board were approximately as stated, \$97,000, and as shown on pages 45 and 170, and in addition to that, that there were other agencies of the Government paid for by those agencies, temporarily loaned to this Statistical Board, whose compensation amounted to \$44,000, and that there were expenditures chargeable to the chairman's office of \$38,000, so that the entire expenditures spent directly and indirectly aggregated about \$180,000, and for that reason I further stated that the committee amended the bill and reduced the authorization from \$200,000 to \$180,000.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I did not hear this explanation of the amount expended, but the amount spent covers 2 years, and even on the gentleman's say-so, it would be doubling it up by this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There must not be any misunderstanding. I have given the total figures and estimates up to June 30, 1935. I told the gentleman for the first 6 months there were not so many employees and the expense was at a minimum, so that the amounts spent may be taken as a fair criterion as to what the annual expenditures have been. The correct information is that other agencies of the Government advanced and loaned employees to the Board not mentioned on said pages 45 and 170, so that the estimate of \$180,000 is fair.

Mr. RICH. My colleague has given the gentleman information that was given the committee, that \$190,000 annually was to be the amount that would be necessary to cause this committee to function.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, after line 21, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 9. This act shall cease to be in effect and the agencies established hereunder shall cease to exist at the expiration of 5 years after the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, there is one sentence in the report that I desire to call attention to. It is: To make it easier to locate available information on any subject.

If there is anything that this House as a body of legislators needs in making statements on the floor and giving figures that have absolute authenticity behind them, it is this Central Statistical Bureau, to which we can appeal to get various data necessary to complete our statements and make them worth uttering on the floor of the House. For that reason I am in favor of this measure. And I hope that every fair-

minded and every thinking Member of the House who is interested in giving definite, authentic, reliable information where figures are concerned will vote for the bill, because it is a measure that will enable us not only to legislate intelligently but to discuss subjects on the floor intelligently. I hope that the House will pass this bill without further ado.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the resolution the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RANKIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7590, and, pursuant to House Resolution 249, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 68, noes 51.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 213, nays 117, answered "present" 1, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

YEAS—213

Adair	Delaney	Healey	Norton
Amle	Dempsey	Hildebrandt	O'Brien
Arnold	Dickstein	Hill, Ala.	O'Connell
Ashbrook	Dietrich	Hill, Knute	O'Connor
Barden	Dingell	Hill, Samuel B.	O'Day
Bell	Disney	Hobbs	O'Leary
Berlin	Dobbins	Hoeppel	Owen
Biermann	Dockweller	Hook	Patterson
Blanton	Dorsey	Houston	Peterson, Fla.
Boehne	Doxey	Huddleston	Polk
Boland	Drewry	Imhoff	Ramspeck
Boylan	Driscoll	Jacobsen	Randolph
Brown, Ga.	Driver	Jenckes, Ind.	Rankin
Brunner	Duffey, Ohio	Johnson, Okla.	Rayburn
Buck	Duffy, N. Y.	Johnson, Tex.	Reilly
Buckler, Minn.	Duncan	Johnson, W. Va.	Rich
Caldwell	Dunn, Pa.	Jones	Richards
Cannon, Mo.	Eckert	Kee	Robertson
Carmichael	Edmiston	Keller	Robinson, Utah
Carpenter	Elcher	Kennedy, Md.	Rogers, N. H.
Cartwright	Ellenbogen	Kerr	Rogers, Okla.
Cary	Evans	Kocialkowski	Romjue
Casey	Faddis	Kramer	Rudd
Castellow	Ferguson	Kvale	Ryan
Celler	Fernandez	Lewis, Colo.	Sabath
Chandler	Fitzpatrick	Lloyd	Sanders, La.
Chapman	Ford, Calif.	Lucas	Sanders, Tex.
Citron	Frey	Lundeen	Schaefer
Coffee	Fulker	McAndrews	Schuetz
Colden	Gasque	McCormack	Schulte
Cole, Md.	Gavagan	McGehee	Scott
Colmer	Gifford	McGrath	Scrugham
Connery	Gildea	McKeough	Sears
Cooley	Gingery	McLaughlin	Smith, Conn.
Cooper, Tenn.	Granfield	McReynolds	Smith, Va.
Corning	Gray, Pa.	Mahon	Smith, Wash.
Costello	Green	Mason	Smith, W. Va.
Cox	Greenway	Massingale	Snyder
Cravens	Greenwood	Maverick	Spence
Crosby	Greever	Mead	Stack
Crosser, Ohio	Gregory	Meeks	Starnes
Cullen	Griswold	Merritt, N. Y.	Stubbs
Cummings	Haines	Miller	Sullivan
Daly	Hancock, N. C.	Monaghan	Summers, Tex.
Darden	Harlan	Moran	Tarver
Deen	Hart	Moritz	Taylor, Colo.
	Harter	Murdock	Taylor, S. C.

Terry
Thom
Thomason
Thompson
Tolan
Tonry
Utterback

Vinson, Ga.
Vinson, Ky.
Wallgren
Walter
Warren
Wearin
Weaver

Werner
West
Whelchel
Whittington
Wilcox
Williams
Wilson, La.

Wood
Woodrum
Zimmerman
Zioncheck

NAYS—117

Allen
Andresen
Andrew, Mass.
Andrews, N. Y.
Arends
Bacharach
Bacon
Binderup
Blackney
Boileau
Brewster
Buchanan
Buckbee
Burdick
Burnham
Carlson
Carter
Cavichia
Christianson
Church
Cole, N. Y.
Crawford
Culkin
Darrow
Ditter
Dondero
Doutrich
Ekwall
Engel
Englebright

Fenerty
Fiesinger
Fish
Fletcher
Focht
Ford, Miss.
Fulmer
Gearhart
Gehrmann
Gilchrist
Goodwin
Gray, Ind.
Guyer
Gwynne
Hallock
Hancock, N. Y.
Hess
Higgins, Conn.
Hoffman
Hope
Hull
Jenkins, Ohio
Kahn
Kennedy
Kimball
Kinzer
Kloeb
Kniffin
Knutson
Lambeth

Lanham
Lehlbach
Lemke
Lord
Luckey
Ludlow
McFarlane
Maas
Mapes
Marcantonio
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Merritt, Conn.
Michener
Millard
Mitchell, Tenn.
Montague
Mott
Nelson
O'Neal
Pearson
Peterson, Ga.
Pettengill
Pierce
Pittenger
Plumley
Powers
Ransley
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.

Robison, Ky.
Rogers, Mass.
Sauthoff
Schneider
Secrest
Seger
Snell
South
Stefan
Sutphin
Sweeney
Taber
Taylor, Tenn.
Thomas
Thurston
Tinkham
Tobey
Turner
Turpin
Umstead
Welch
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Pa.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Young

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Doughton

NOT VOTING—98

Ayers
Bankhead
Beam
Beiter
Bland
Bloom
Bolton
Brennan
Brooks
Brown, Mich.
Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle
Cannon, Wis.
Claiborne
Clark, Idaho
Clark, N. C.
Cochran
Collins
Cooper, Ohio
Cross, Tex.
Crowe
Crowther
Dear
DeRouen
Dies

Dirksen
Dunn, Miss.
Eagle
Eaton
Farley
Flannagan
Gambrell
Gassaway
Gillette
Goldsborough
Hamlin
Hartley
Hennings
Higgins, Mass.
Hollister
Holmes
Kelly
Kennedy, N. Y.
Kleberg
Kopplemann
Lambertson
Lamneck
Larrabee
Lea, Calif.
Lee, Okla.

Lesinski
Lewis, Md.
McClellan
McGroarty
McLean
McLeod
McMillan
McSwain
Maloney
Mansfield
Martin, Colo.
May
Mitchell, Ill.
Montet
Nichols
Oliver
O'Malley
Palmisano
Parks
Parsons
Patman
Patton
Perkins
Peyser
Pfeifer

Quinn
Rabaut
Ramsay
Reece
Richardson
Russell
Sadowski
Sandlin
Shanley
Shannon
Short
Sirovich
Sisson
Somers, N. Y.
Steagall
Stewart
Treadway
Underwood
Wadsworth
White
Withrow
Wolfenden
Woodruff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
On this vote:

Mr. Doughton (for) with Mr. Treadway (against).
Mr. McSwain (for) with Mr. Short (against).
Mr. Gassaway (for) with Mr. Crowther (against).
Mr. Patman (for) with Mr. Holmes (against).
Mr. Pfeifer (for) with Mr. Stewart (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Cross of Texas with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. McLeod.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Sandlin with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Collins.
Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Eagle with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Lea of California with Mr. Perkins.
Mr. Lewis of Maryland with Mr. Reece.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Wolfenden.
Mr. Parks with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. May with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Parsons with Mr. Farley.
Mr. Shanley with Mr. Crowe.
Mr. Sisson with Mr. Hamlin.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Clark of Idaho.
Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Ayers.
Mr. McClellan with Mr. McGroarty.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Lee of Oklahoma.
Mr. Montet with Mr. Brennan.
Mr. Claiborne with Mr. Mitchell of Illinois.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Dunn of Mississippi.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Gambrell.

Mr. White with Mr. Higgins of Massachusetts.
Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Underwood.
Mr. Gillette with Mr. Dear.
Mr. Hennings with Mr. Richardson.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Ramsay.
Mr. Sirovich with Mr. Sadowski.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Palmisano.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Nichols.
Mr. Martin of Colorado with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Brooks.
Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Larrabee.
Mr. Beiter with Mr. Russell.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts, is unavoidably absent. If present he would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
On motion by Mr. GASQUE a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.
The doors were opened.

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY ACT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution, S. J. Res. 113, to extend until April 1, 1936, certain provisions of title I of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and for other purposes, and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

The Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the resolution, S. J. Res. 113, with an amendment as follows:

To the text of said amendment, after the word "repealed", in the last line thereof, insert:

"Provided, That the exemption provided in section 5 of such title shall extend only to agreements and action thereunder, (1) putting into effect the requirements of section 7 (a), including minimum wages, maximum hours, and prohibition of child labor, and (2) prohibiting unfair competitive practices which offend against existing law, including the antitrust laws, or which constitute unfair methods of competition under the Federal Trade Commission Act as amended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I well appreciate the fact that a technical objection by me at this time would only delay this bill for a comparatively few hours. If I could defeat the final passage of the resolution, I certainly would object, because a majority of the Members on the Republican side of the aisle not only now but always have been opposed to the National Industrial Recovery Act, and I believe that the decision by the Supreme Court confirmed our position.

So far as the amendment is concerned, I am in favor of the amendment itself; but this bill could not be amended in such manner that it would suit me so that I would vote for a continuation of the N. R. A. However, under the circumstances I am not going to object to considering the Senate amendment at this time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I do not care to yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we are asked to agree to an amendment of the Senate. The Senate was in session all night last night, and we have been in committee or in session all day today and we have not had an opportunity to study these amendments, nor have we had an opportunity—

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. RICH. If you do not wait a minute, this will be objected to. It is somewhat disconcerting, Mr. Speaker, to have the regular order called for when we are trying to find out what is in the legislation.

I have given warning to the Membership on the Democratic side of the House that it is time to stop bringing these bills and conference reports in here for approval without due consideration. We are supposed to be men of ability and men who think for ourselves. It is time for the Members of this House to think for themselves. It is time for the Members of this House to deal with things which are for the best interests of the country. [Applause.]

The regular order was called for.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania object to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. RICH. If I am given time to express myself, I may not object; if not, I do object. There is certainly no reason why those of us who think for the best interest of the country and who vote our convictions should not be heard.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances I call for the regular order. We are not going to listen to chastisement.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I announce that the Rules Committee will meet immediately the House adjourns.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to consider individual bills on the Private Calendar under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to consider individual bills on the Private Calendar under the rules of the House.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not expect to object, do I understand that we are to consider only individual bills on the Private Calendar?

The SPEAKER. The Chair so stated with respect to the consideration of the Private Calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, is not this similar to the order that was entered yesterday?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; it is just a continuation of it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONNERY. Do I understand that should the Rules Committee bring in a rule for the passage of the bill extending the N. R. A. it could be taken up tomorrow?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The order for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar does not affect anything else that may properly come before the House.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7160) to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture, to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work, and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JONES, FULMER, and HOPE.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

At the request of Mr. HILL of Alabama, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. STEAGALL, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. OLIVER, on account of illness.

THE SO-CALLED "GRASS ROOTS" CONVENTION OF "YOUNGSTERS" "VIEWS WITH ALARM" BUT FAILS TO "POINT WITH PRIDE" TO HOOVER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this week in the city of Springfield, Ill., there was held a meeting of the faithful few who still admit they are loyal followers of the Grand Old Party.

Press dispatches, as reported in yesterday's and today's papers, make it plain that this much-advertised meeting that was to take the form of a Nation-wide gathering of Republican leaders was a dismal flop. It was said one purpose of the meeting was to reform the broken and tangled forces of the remnants of the G. O. P., and especially to fire the young Republicans that may be left in the Nation with zeal to enter the 1936 national campaign.

Another primary purpose of the gathering, so the country was assured, was to lay out a definite program for the national campaign next year.

A "young recruit", well up in his seventies, made the first keynote speech sounding the call to arms to the other youngsters. We are told that other "keynoters" consisted of defeated professional politicians from Indiana, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and possibly other States.

Of course, this "big" convention had to resolve and "view with alarm." We are told it did so at some length. Running true to form, it "viewed with alarm", but to the utter surprise of the country, it did not spend much, if any, time in "pointing with pride" to the achievements of the last Republican administration. In fact, we are told that the name of Herbert Hoover was not so much as mentioned in the resolutions or by the Republican orators and spellbinders who met in Springfield yesterday.

They did not have the courage to say that the "great engineer" did the best he could. But so far as the world knows he was completely ignored and shunned by his ex-followers who once cheered and shouted themselves hoarse at the mere mention of his name. What a pang of sorrow must have swelled in the heart of Herbert Hoover when he read this morning's papers to learn that he had been ignored and rebuffed by a convention said to have been made up largely by men he had elevated to high places in the Government—colaborers who were in part responsible for the dismal failure of the Hoover administration.

In looking over the resolutions, it would seem that these "young Republicans" apparently could not make up their minds whether they were for or against the new deal. They did not denounce the present administration's farm program or denounce the processing tax that has come in for so much criticism from Republican leaders on the floor of this House.

Again, they did not denounce the banking laws that have been passed under the Roosevelt administration, evidently for the reason that such action would have called attention to the fact that more than 10,000 banks failed under the last two Republican administrations and practically none under the new deal.

About the only thing the Republican leaders who gathered in the Springfield conclave were sure of is that they are for the Constitution as it now stands without the changing of a comma. They now insist they are for it without the changing of the dotting of an "i" or a crossing of a "t." Yet history records that the G. O. P. was founded primarily for the purpose of revising the Constitution as written by our forefathers and that in the first few years of the party's history that the G. O. P. wrote three important and far-reaching amendments into the Federal Constitution.

Some of today's papers state that inasmuch as the former office holders and other G. O. P. leaders evidently could not get together on any kind of a program or a candidate for 1936, that they propose to call another meeting in a desperate effort to arouse the young Republicans of the country to battle. They also reluctantly admit that their first effort was a fruitless adventure and a flat failure.

The newspapers say that it is proposed to have similar "grass roots" rallies in the East, Central, Middle Atlantic, and border States, and, in fact, all around the circle.

I am curious to know why they designated the Springfield gathering a "grass-roots convention." Could our Republican friends have been looking for the roots of the grass that the great engineer told us was to grow in the streets of the cities of the country if the Democrats won the 1932 election? I assume they are inspecting the roots to see why they failed to sprout.

But if I were prone to give advice, I would suggest that our Republican friends never will be able to get together if they hold many of these rejuvenation experiments. Suppose they should have one in New England and, casting discretion to the winds, should vote resolutions denouncing the processing tax and the A. A. A. program. I suppose Colonel Knox, Republican editor, who, it is stated, would appreciate a complimentary nomination, might cooperate by refusing to publish the news in his paper, but there are some Democratic editors in the Middle West who would be heartless enough to broadcast the resolutions and the fat of the old elephant would be in the fire. That is, if he has any fat left.

Pep meetings will not do any good unless you can get together on the cheers. The G. O. P. is on the way out. The party can take one of three positions:

First. Denounce the new deal in toto, which will not be done.

Second. Denounce the new deal in part and agree with it in part. This cannot be done, because of the many conflicting elements in the party. For example, how will the Middle West and New England ever get together on the farm program?

Third. The various candidates can be turned loose "on their own", some denouncing all of the new deal, some part of it, and some making new-deal campaigns. This was done in the last congressional elections; but who is going to suggest how this can be done in a campaign where a President is to be elected and efforts made to appeal to the entire country?

In closing let me say that, in spite of the so-called "grass roots" meetings that may be held in the future by the so-called "young Republicans" and in spite of the flow of oratory from the worn out and "has been" professional spellbinders and in spite of the mistakes that have been made by some of those now in authority, economic conditions are gradually but surely getting better. The farmer as well as the merchant, though still struggling as the result of the Hoover depression, are coming into their own.

A vast majority of the people of America, irrespective of politics, have faith in Franklin D. Roosevelt, whose great heart beats in sympathy with the toiling masses, a man who is doing his utmost to bring order out of the discord, strife, and chaos that faced this Nation as those who now "view with alarm" left it at the close of the Hoover regime.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 203. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Connecticut River, with a view to the control of its floods and prevention of erosion of its banks, in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

S. 540. An act for the relief of Fred Luscher; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 556. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1146. An act for the relief of Michael Dalton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1179. An act for the relief of James H. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1186. An act for the relief of Frank P. Ross; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1409. An act for the relief of the General Baking Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1453. An act to create a Board of Shorthand Reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1490. An act for the relief of Earl A. Ross; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1613. An act for the relief of Andrew J. McCallen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1865. An act for the relief of W. S. O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1893. An act to restore to the public domain portions of the Jordan Narrows (Utah) Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2001. An act to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of Congress approved May 16, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2010. An act to improve the living accommodations on vessels under 100 tons; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2169. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2206. An act for the relief of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2388. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel patent in fee issued to Victoria Arconge; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2406. An act for the relief of Nancy Jordan; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2421. An act to amend the act entitled "An act forbidding the transportation of any person in interstate or foreign commerce kidnaped or otherwise unlawfully detained, and making such act a felony", as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2521. An act amending section 5 of Public Law No. 264, Seventy-third Congress, approved May 29, 1934, relative to the appointment of Naval Academy graduates as ensigns in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2556. An act to amend and supplement the steering rules respecting orders to helmsmen on all vessels navigating waters of the United States, and on all vessels of the United States navigating any waters or seas, in section 1 of the act of August 19, 1890, section 1 of the act of June 7, 1897, section 1 of the act of February 8, 1895, and section 1 of the act of February 19, 1895; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2611. An act to authorize the Utah Pioneer Trails and Landmarks Association to construct and maintain a monument on the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, Salt Lake City, Utah; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2649. An act to provide for a recreation area within the Prescott National Forest, Ariz.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2715. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Choctaw Indians of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2737. An act authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a suitable terminal marker for the Jefferson Davis National Highway; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 2743. An act to authorize the erection of a suitable memorial to Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals within the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2774. An act for the relief of certain officers on the retired list of the Navy and Marine Corps who have been commended for their performance of duty in actual combat with the enemy during the World War; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2796. An act to provide for the control and elimination of public-utility holding companies operating, or marketing securities, in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails, to regulate the transmission and sale of electric energy in interstate commerce, to amend the Federal Water Power Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2846. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States the devise and bequest of real and personal property of the late Paul E. McDonnold, passed assistant surgeon with the rank of lieutenant commander, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2865. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the George Rogers Clark Sesquicentennial Commission, approved May 23, 1928; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 2889. An act to authorize settlement, allowance, and payment of certain claims; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2891. An act to provide for the adjustment and settlement of personal injury and death cases arising in certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2965. An act to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920; to the Committee on the Territories.

S. 2966. An act to empower the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the issuance of revenue bonds, to authorize the city and county of Honolulu to issue flood-control bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

S. 2993. An act for the relief of Carrie Price Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution to create a commission to determine a suitable location and design for a memorial to the men and women who have been notable or may become notable in the history of the United States; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution requesting the President to extend to the International Statistical Institute an invitation to hold its twenty-fourth session in the United States in 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 410. An act to provide fees to be charged by the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 2100. An act to amend an act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended, by adding three new sections, to be numbered 802 (a), 802 (b), and 802 (c), respectively.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on June 12, 1935, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 67. An act to repeal certain laws providing that certain aliens who have filed declarations of intention to become citizens of the United States shall be considered citizens for the purposes of service and protection on American vessels;

H. R. 2204. An act for the relief of Robert M. Kenton;
H. R. 2422. An act for the relief of James O. Greene and Mrs. Hollis S. Hogan;

H. R. 2466. An act for the relief of John E. Click;
H. R. 2553. An act for the relief of Eva S. Brown;
H. R. 2683. An act for the relief of Henry Harrison Griffith;
H. R. 4448. An act to provide funds for acquisition of a site, erection of buildings, and the furnishing thereof for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States at Helsingfors, Finland;

H. R. 4798. An act to authorize the settlement of individual claims of military personnel for damages to and loss of private property incident to the training, practice, operation, or maintenance of the Army;

H. R. 5456. An act relating to the powers and duties of United States marshals;

H. R. 5564. An act for the relief of Capt. Russell Willson, United States Navy;

H. R. 5720. An act to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended;

H. R. 6371. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for books for the adult blind.

H. R. 6437. An act to amend Private Act No. 5, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to convey certain land in the county of Los Angeles, State of California";

H. R. 6987. An act authorizing the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas to construct, maintain, and operate a

free highway bridge across the Sabine River at or near a point where Louisiana Highway No. 7 meets Texas Highway No. 87;

H. R. 7081. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Brownville, Nebr.;

H. R. 7781. An act to define the election procedure under the act of June 18, 1934, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9 as Leif Erikson Day;

H. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution providing for extension of cooperative work of the Geological Survey to Puerto Rico;

H. J. Res. 204. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial to the late Jean Jules Jusserand;

H. J. Res. 285. Joint resolution to permit the temporary entry into the United States under certain conditions of alien participants and officials of the National Boy Scout Jamboree to be held in the United States in 1935; and

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution to extend from June 16, 1935, to June 16, 1938, the period within which loans made prior to June 16, 1933, to executive officers of member banks of the Federal Reserve System may be renewed or extended.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CAP R. CARDEN

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of profound regret that I announce the passing away this morning in the city of Louisville, Ky., of our beloved colleague from Kentucky, the Honorable CAP R. CARDEN. All who knew CAP CARDEN were his friends, because he lived in Emerson's maxim, "The only way to have a friend is to be a friend." He was a true Kentucky gentleman, a man with high-placed thoughts deep-seated in a heart of courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 255

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CAP R. CARDEN, a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following committee on the part of the House: Messrs. GREGORY, CARY, SPENCE, and ROBSON of Kentucky.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 14, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KENNEDY of New York: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 8279. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to institutions organized for the purpose of making loans for the payment of taxes on real estate, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PLUMLEY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 978. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the University of Oregon certain lands forming a part of the Coos Head River and Harbor Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PLUMLEY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2738. An act to authorize the use of park property in the District of Columbia and its environs by the Boy Scouts of America at their national jamboree; without amendment (Rept. No. 1181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TERRY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7740. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Missouri to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Black River at or near the north line of section 2, township 24 north, range 6 east, near Poplar Bluff, Mo.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1185). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7897. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River, at Elizabeth, in the county of Allegheny, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; with amendment (Rept. No. 1186). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7924. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at Fort Allegany, in the county of McKean, State of Pennsylvania; with amendment (Rept. No. 1187). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7928. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Ford City, Pa.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1188). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7932. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Susquehanna River at Wyalusing, in the county of Bradford, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; with amendment (Rept. No. 1189). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA of California: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7979. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Puget Sound at or near a point commonly known as "The Narrows" in the State of Washington; with amendment (Rept. No. 1190). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8098. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mahoning River at or near Edinburg, in the county of Lawrence, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; with amendment (Rept. No. 1191). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8131. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Owensboro, Ky.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1192). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8183. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Allegheny River at Emlenton, in the county of Venango, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; with amendment (Rept. No. 1193). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8187. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Allegheny River, at Tionesta, in Tionesta Township, and in the county of Forest, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; with amendment (Rept. No. 1194). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8189. A bill granting the consent of Con-

gress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Allegheny River, at East Brady, in the counties of Clarion and Armstrong, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; with amendment (Rept. No. 1195). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WADSWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2681. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near West Swanton, Vt., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1196). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HILL of Alabama: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8443. A bill authorizing an appropriation to the American Legion for use in connection with Pershing Hall, a memorial already erected in Paris, France, to the commander in chief, officers, men, and auxiliary services of the American Expeditionary Forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 1197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 256. Resolution for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 113; without amendment (Rept. No. 1198). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 257. Resolution for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 131; without amendment (Rept. No. 1199). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 258. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 319; without amendment (Rept. No. 1200). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TURNER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6275. A bill for the relief of John Livingston and Mrs. John Livingston; with amendment (Rept. No. 1183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TURNER: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1347. An act for the relief of Robert J. Smith, alias William McClocklin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H. R. 8473) to provide for the compiling and publishing of the Official Register of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DeROUEN: A bill (H. R. 8474) to provide for the creation of the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument on Put in Bay, South Bass Island, in the State of Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MONAGHAN: A bill (H. R. 8475) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by creating and establishing a Federal Radio Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 8476) to amend the Sherman Antitrust Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM: A bill (H. R. 8477) authorizing the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to purchase from Reno School District No. 10, Reno, Nev., the building generally known as the "Southside School Annex" for the housing therein of governmental relief agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOLTON: A bill (H. R. 8478) making an appropriation to provide compensation to special assistants to the Attorney General of the United States in the case of the United States versus the Pan American Petroleum Co.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 8479) to stabilize the bituminous coal-mining industry and promote its interstate commerce; to provide for cooperative marketing of bituminous coal; to levy a tax on bituminous coal and provide for a draw-back under certain conditions; to declare the production, distribution, and use of bituminous coal to be affected with a national public interest; to conserve the bituminous-coal resources of the United States and to establish a national bituminous-coal reserve; to provide for the general welfare, and for other purposes; and providing penalties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8480) to authorize the acquisition of land on McNeil Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution (H. Res. 251) to pay Marshall Solberg for services as attorney to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 252) to pay George F. R. Cumerow for investigative services to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 253) for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 89, directing the Comptroller General to readjust the account between the United States and the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KNUTSON: Resolution (H. Res. 254) directing the Secretary of State to transmit to the House of Representatives facts touching upon the failure of the Republics of Brazil and Colombia to ratify certain trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, creating the Hawaii Housing Authority; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 8481) for the relief of Mrs. Morris Dietrich; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DUFFY of New York: A bill (H. R. 8482) for the relief of Jacob G. Ackerman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEALEY: A bill (H. R. 8483) for the relief of James H. Martell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 8484) for the relief of Charles L. Lindquist; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAVERICK: A bill (H. R. 8485) for the relief of Pettus H. Hemphill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 8486) for the relief of John A. Baker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8487) for the relief of R. M. Rogan Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8488) granting a pension to Mary Bolton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHANLEY: A bill (H. R. 8489) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Sperry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8490) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Schaeffer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UTTERBACK: A bill (H. R. 8491) for the relief of Mrs. Harry E. Craven; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8819. By Mr. DARROW: Memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, opposing enactment of the Wagner-Connery labor-relations bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8820. By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petition of O. R. Pang, of Warren, Pa., giving specific criticisms of the labor-disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8821. By Mr. EDMISTON: Petition of employees of the West Virginia Glass Specialty Co., protesting against recip-

rocal treaty agreements with foreign countries that will cause an influx of foreign-made goods into this country, thereby causing greater unemployment among the workers of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8822. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of J. E. Lambert, route 2, Teague, Tex., favoring House bill 5587; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8823. By Mr. KEE: Petition of R. L. McKinney and other citizens of Summers County, W. Va., urging the Congress of the United States of America to eliminate the taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8824. Also, petition of W. H. Cantees and other citizens of Williamson, W. Va., urging the Congress of the United States to eliminate the taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8825. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif., memorializing the President of the United States to make ample provision for the encouragement of the artistic, cultural, humane, patriotic, and sentimental phases of our American national life in the Federal works plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8826. Also, petition of the city of Los Angeles, which disapproves of section 11 of House bill 6511 in that same does not provide for competitive, off-route passenger and express service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8827. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Intercoastal Lumber Distributors Association, Inc., New York, N. Y., condemning the Wagner labor-disputes bill (S. 1958) and the Connery labor-disputes bill (H. R. 6288) as calculated to force upon the United States a condition of state capitalism, etc.; to the Committee on Labor.

8828. By Mr. MERRITT of New York: Resolution of the Drug Products Co., Inc., of 26-32 Skillman Avenue, Long Island City, N. Y., endorsing the enactment of Senate bill 5, to revise the Federal Food and Drug Act, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8829. By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the Fifty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, petitioning Congress to reduce the Federal tax on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8830. Also, petition of the general committee of immigrant aid at Ellis Island and New York Harbor, urging passage of House bill 8163; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8831. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Resolution No. 98, House of Representatives, State of Michigan, endorsing the Guffey stabilization coal bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8832. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of the Cleveland Joint Board International Ladies Garment Workers Union, by their secretary, N. Solomon, Cleveland, Ohio, urging support of the Wagner labor-disputes bill, the Black 30-hour-week bill, and the Guffey coal bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8833. Also, petition of Cleveland Local No. 180 of Paper and Corrugated Box Workers, Cleveland, Ohio, by their secretary, Pauline Maezer, urging support of the Wagner labor-disputes bill and all other labor legislation beneficial to workers; to the Committee on Labor.

8834. Also, petition of the Chemical Workers Union 19019, Barberton, Ohio, by their president, A. P. Lee, urging support of the Wagner labor-disputes bill and the Black 30-hour-week bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8835. Also, petition of Local 19114, Canton, Ohio, by their recording secretary, Charles B. May, urging support of the Wagner disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

8836. Also, petition of directors of the Cincinnati Young Women's Christian Association, Cincinnati, Ohio, by their recording secretary, Mrs. Stanley K. Henshaw, urging support of the Costigan-Wagner bill (H. R. 2776), providing for the Federal enforcement of laws against lynching when local authorities fail, and localizing the financial and legal responsibility in the county where lynching is committed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.